



CHRISTIANITY TODAY

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY

The Challenge of the Future

J. EDGAR HOOVER

What Shall the Church Do?

WILLIAM H. BECKMANN

Cross or Crescent in Africa?

BEN J. MARAIS

UNPUBLISHED SERMON:

The Unity of the Church

CHARLES HODGE

EDITORIAL:

Principles of Church Unity



CHRISTIANITY TODAY

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY

1014 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C.

Volume II • Number 17 • May 26, 1958

CARL F. H. HENRY, Editor

J. MARCELLUS KIK, Associate Editor

L. NELSON BELL, Executive Editor

CHARLES CLAUD, Advertising and Business Manager

LINDA J. MILLER, Circulation Manager

DAVID E. KUCHARSKY, News Editor

FRANK FARRELL, Editorial Associate

CONTENTS

THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE	3
J. Edgar Hoover	
WHAT SHALL THE CHURCH DO?	5
William H. Beckmann	
CROSS OR CRESCENT IN AFRICA?	8
Ben J. Marais	
THE FINAL JUDGMENT	10
J. Theodore Mueller	
CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE AND PSYCHOLOGY	13
Bernard Ramm	
BIBLE TEXT OF THE MONTH	15
Matthew 5:6	
EUTYCHUS AND HIS KIN	16
A LAYMAN AND HIS FAITH	19
EDITORIALS:	20
Principles of Church Unity	
Japan's Call for Evangelistic Missionaries	
THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH	23
Charles Hodge	
NEWS: CHRISTIANITY IN THE WORLD TODAY	28
BOOKS IN REVIEW	35
REVIEW OF CURRENT RELIGIOUS THOUGHT	40
Stuart Barton Babbage	

CORRESPONDENTS

TOM ALLAN	Scotland
CHARLES F. BALL	Chicago
JERRY BEAVAN	Evangelism at Large
TRYGVE BJERKREHEIM	Norway
WILHELM BRAUER	Germany
CALVIN CHAO	Singapore
FRANK COLQUHOUN	England
L. DAVID COWIE	Seattle
A. CLIFFORD	Argentina
A. THAKUR DAS	Pakistan
R. L. DECKER	Kansas City
BORIS DECORVET	Switzerland
PETER DE VISSER	Grand Rapids
JAMES I. DICKSON	Formosa
W. HAROLD FULLER	West Africa
J. WAYTE FULTON	Miami
ROY E. GRACE	Philadelphia
G. A. HADJANTONIOU	Greece
J. LESTER HARNISH	Los Angeles
STUART HARRISON	Peru
T. W. HAZLEWOOD	Toronto
LANGDON HENDERLITE	Brazil
BANJAMIN HERAS	Spain
D. KOILPITCHAI	India
ELMER F. KRAEMER	St. Louis
T. LEONARD LEWIS	Boston
PAUL LILJENBERG	Sweden
ROBERT S. LUTZ	Denver
BEN J. MARAIS	South Africa
W. W. MARICHAL	Belgium
JAMES A. McALPINE	Japan
DON McCLURE	The Sudan
W. A. MCGILL	Egypt
TOM McMAHAN	Columbia, S. C.
ROGER B. McSHANE	Detroit
HERBERT MEKEEL	Schenectady
R. STRANG MILLER	New Zealand
SAMUEL H. MOFFETT	Korea
BENJAMIN MORAES	Brazil
JOHN MORRISON	Belgian Congo
RICHARD K. MORTON	Jacksonville
WILLIAM MUELLER	Louisville
ROBERT BOYD MUNGER	San Francisco
SIDNEY W. MURRAY	Ireland
CHARLES V. NAUGLE	Allentown, Pa.
EURIPIDES NICOLAIDES	Jordan
J. M. NICOLE	Paris
JOHN NOVOTNEY	Edmonton
J. EDWIN ORR	Evangelism at Large
W. STANFORD REID	Montreal
W. DAYTON ROBERTS	Costa Rica
J. HERVEY ROSS	Mexico
BENJAMIN SANTANA	Puerto Rico
C. RALSTON SMITH	Oklahoma City
GERALD B. SMITH	Minneapolis-St. Paul
PAUL G. STEPHAN	Des Moines
JACK STOWELL	Philippine Islands
P. N. TABLANTE-GARRIDO	Venezuela
CLYDE W. TAYLOR	Washington, D. C.
PAUL E. TOMS	Hawaii
RENATO TULLI	Italy
ABE C. VAN DER PUY	Ecuador
VANCE WEBSTER	Eugene, Ore.
CARY N. WEISIGER III	Pittsburgh
FARIS D. WHITESELL	Chicago
EDGAR WILLIAMS	Jamaica
FRANK T. WOODWARD	Iran
G. BRILLENBURG WURTH	The Netherlands
IRVIN S. YEAWORTH	Cincinnati

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

OSWALD T. ALLIS
Wayne, Pa.
G. C. BERKOUWER
Free University of Amsterdam
ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD
Emeritus, Princeton Seminary
ROBERT F. BOYD
Assembly's Training School
(Presb. U.S.)
GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY
St. Thomas Episcopal, Edinburgh
F. F. BRUCE
University of Sheffield
GORDON H. CLARK
Butler University
F. P. COPLAND SIMMONS
St. Andrew's Presbyterian, London
EARL L. DOUGLASS
Princeton, N. J.
EDWARD L. R. ELSON
National Presbyterian, Washington
WILLIAM FITCH
Knox Presbyterian, Toronto
C. DARBY FULTON
Bd. of World Missions (Presb. U.S.)
FRANK E. GAEBELEIN
Stony Brook School
JOHN H. GERSTNER
Pittsburgh-Xenia Theol. Sem.

BILLY GRAHAM
Montreat, N. C.
RICHARD C. HALVERSON
Christian Leadership
WILLIAM K. HARRISON
Evangelical Welfare Agency
C. ADRIAN HEATON
Eastern Baptist Theol. Sem.
PHILIP E. HUGHES
London, England
NORMAN C. HUNT
University of Edinburgh
W. BOYD HUNT
Southwestern Baptist Theol. Sem.
W. HARRY JELLEMA
Calvin College
CLYDE S. KILBY
Wheaton College
HAROLD B. KUHN
Asbury Theol. Sem.
ROBERT J. LAMONT
First Presbyterian, Pittsburgh
ROLAND Q. LEAVELL
New Orleans Baptist Theol. Sem.
PIERRE MARCEL
St. Germain En Laye, France
DUKE MCCALL
Southern Baptist Theol. Sem.
SAMUEL MOFFETT
Seoul, Korea

ARTHUR J. MOORE
Bishop, The Methodist Church
J. THEODORE MUELLER
Concordia Theol. Sem.
ROGER NICOLE
Gordon Divinity School
HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA
Park Street Church, Boston
STANLEY W. OLSON
Baylor Univ. College of Medicine
J. C. POLLOCK
Templecombe, Somerset, England
BERNARD RAMM
Baylor University
PAUL S. REES
Minneapolis, Minn.
W. STANFORD REID
McGill University
WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON
Columbia Theol. Sem.
W. E. SANGSTER
London
SAMUEL M. SHOEMAKER
Calvary Episcopal, Pittsburgh
WILBUR M. SMITH
Fuller Theol. Sem.
NED B. STONEHOUSE
Westminster Theol. Sem.
JOHN R. W. STOTT
All Souls Langham Pl., London

JAMES G. S. S. THOMSON
Columbia Theological Seminary
CARY N. WEISIGER III
Mt. Lebanon U.P., Pittsburgh
FARIS D. WHITESELL
Northern Baptist Theol. Sem.
MAURICE A. P. WOOD
St. Mary's Islington, London
KYLE M. YATES
Baylor University
FRED YOUNG
Central Baptist Theol. Sem.

Copyright 1958 by Christianity Today, Inc. Accepting as controlled circulation publication at Washington, D. C., and Dayton, Ohio. Published fortnightly by Christianity Today, Inc., 1014 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C. Subscription rates: one year \$5; two years \$8; three years, \$10. (Outside United States and Canada, \$1 per year additional. Foreign Subscription Representative, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1-5 Portpool Lane, London, EC1, England.)

\$5 a year • Single copy, 25 cents

The Challenge of the Future

J. EDGAR HOOVER

In this year of 1958, when the world is so rent by divisive forces, America stands in great need of spiritual guidance. The country as a whole must draw from its great heritage of religious freedom, justice and liberty to meet the challenge of the future. Ministers of America are truly on the front lines of the battle for freedom. On their shoulders, in large measure, depends the future of our nation.

THE CRIME WAVE

The threat of crime still looms heavily. After World War II there were hopes—now dispelled—that crime rates would subside. Many people thought: "Just wait until normal conditions return and then we'll see life settling back in the good old ways." This has not happened. In 1957, for example, major crimes jumped 9.1 per cent over the comparable figures for 1956! This is an extremely high increase and merits the careful attention of every individual interested in a better society. In 1957, over 2,700,000 major crimes were committed, representing a 23.9 per cent increase over the average for the previous five years.

The great tragedy, moreover, is the evil effect of crime on young people. Persons under the age of 18, for example, in 1957 represented 53.1 per cent of all arrests reported for robbery, auto theft, burglary and larceny. Here lies a most potent danger to law and order. The adult criminal is the product of the juvenile offender. The criminal habits which create the hardened, veteran criminal are formed very frequently in the years of youth.

GUIDANCE OF YOUTH

That is one of our great challenges today—to make American youth into productive citizens of tomorrow. Young people are full of energy, initiative and talent. They are looking for something to do. They need guidance. The key lies here. If that guidance comes from evil minds, from men and women interested in

J. Edgar Hoover has been Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation since 1924. He holds the LL.B. and LL.M. degrees from George Washington University. Seventeen universities and colleges have conferred honorary degrees on him. Mr. Hoover first entered the Department of Justice in 1917.

exploiting youthful energy for criminal pursuits, then that youth's life will be blighted. So often juvenile delinquency is actually adult delinquency—older persons through neglect or lack of interest allow youth to drift into illegal activities.

NEGLECT OF FAMILY LIFE

The family is so important to the proper rearing of young people. Often today, unfortunately, the family is more a name than a fact. The home is merely a place to sleep, to catch a hurried meal or to display fine furniture. Frequently, for example, family members do not eat together—life is so busy! Often the remark is heard, "This is the first meal we have all eaten together for a week." That is a terrible commentary on our way of life. A gathering of the family around the dining table should be encouraged as often as possible. There the saying of a blessing before the meal, giving thanks to Almighty God, is a tie which binds the family. This custom, often neglected today, is an essential ingredient in the rearing of young children. The conversation at the family dining table is vital to the shaping of growing minds. Here members of the family express their opinions, tell their experiences of the day and exchange information. To miss this fellowship is to deprive boys and girls of part of their rightful heritage.

Most important are family worship services. Here the reading of the Bible, the discussion of stories from Scripture, and prayer are invaluable in the developing of youthful character. Many men and women today remember these devotional services in their own family circle. Other facets of their early life have faded from memory, but that picture of father or mother reading the Bible remains bright.

THE MINISTER'S INFLUENCE

We must all work together for a common aim. Ministers, in their contacts with young people and adults, are doing invaluable service in fighting crime. You, as ministers, probably do not realize the great help you can render in molding the career of a young man or woman. Time after time criminals, often with tears in their eyes, tell our special agents that they should

have followed the advice given to them years before by their ministers.

What is needed are men and women willing to take the time to work with young people. How many times in churches, schools and civic organizations do you find this complaint: "We simply can't find anybody who'll work with our young people." Why? Because many people plead they are too busy, that they have too many other things to do, to lend a helping hand.

Such an attitude is wrong. Our youth merit the very best of our attention. We are dealing with the leaders of tomorrow's society. These youngsters need religious training; they need to know the Bible. Adults simply must take the time to work with them. The alternative is an ever-increasing crime-rate.

THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE

Another challenge is that of Communism—the evil appeal of an atheistic doctrine which would destroy our way of life. The clergymen of America can make a great contribution to defeating this menace. Com-

munist is evil. It is anti-God. It seeks to demean the human personality.

Under Communism the human being becomes a slave of the state. He is told what to do. He must think the way the state and party want him to think. Never must he question why.

Communism would destroy our system of free government. In a communist society the Church would be one of the first targets of secret police. Clergymen would be silenced or liquidated. No room exists in Communism for the free play of the human spirit. That is the experience of slave states behind the Iron Curtain.

The clergymen of America have a vital role in meeting this challenge of the future—to defeat crime and subversion. The Church is the heartbeat of America. By urging members to rededicate their lives to God, clergymen are striking against these evil enemies.

This nation was founded on religious freedom. Religions have guided us in years past. They must continue to be our guide in the future. An America faithful to God will be an America free and strong. END

CARRYING HIS PLEA TO THE PEOPLE

By varied means, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's crime appraisals have a way of consistently penetrating to grass roots. His interpretations of trends in lawlessness, which serve to arouse the citizenry, have been attracting ears, eyes, and minds for many years. This month, for example, news media are giving wide publicity to Mr. Hoover's analyses in the two areas of "challenge" presented in the Christianity Today article—influences among youth and Communism. In a message to law enforcement officials, he called for public pressure to halt "ominous trends of crime glorification" in movies and television. In congressional testimony made public he warned that the Communist party in America has renewed and intensified its program of infiltrating mass organizations in order to disguise its operations.

"In the face of the Nation's terrifying juvenile crime wave, we are threatened with a flood of movies and television presentations which flaunt indecency and applaud lawlessness," Mr. Hoover wrote in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. "Film trash mills, which persist in exalting violence and immorality, spew out celluloid poison which is destroying the impressionable minds of youth."

"No standard of decency or code of operations can justify portraying vile gangsters as modern-day Robin Hoods," he added. "Not since the days when thousands filed past the bier of the infamous John Dillinger and made his home a virtual shrine have we witnessed such a brazen affront to our national conscience."

One of the few immediate public reactions to the FBI chief's charges came from Harold E. Fellows, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, who said: "To the best of my knowledge, and that of the members of the Television Code Review Board, there have never been released any

authoritative studies, made by accepted scientific methods, supporting the contention that television contributes materially to juvenile delinquency."

Industry expert Fellows thus implied disagreement with the considered opinion of a respected psychiatrist, Dr. Lawrence Kubie, Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Yale University. Mr. Kubie said in a CBS symposium a few weeks ago: "Quite frankly, I think the movies, TV, comics, the constant confrontation with killing, bloodletting in a form so realistic that to a child it's as real as life itself, cannot fail to have an effect not on the impulse to rebel but on the form that your rebellion will take and what your standard then is of how you express the fact that you are rebelling."

As for Communism, the threat is not waning, Mr. Hoover told a House subcommittee. "We now have approximately 150 known, or suspected, Communist-front and Communist-infiltrated organizations under investigation," he said.

Here is a portion of his testimony:

"Certain organizations obviously dedicate their efforts to thwart the very concepts of this nation's security programs. . . . They protest they are fighting for freedom, but, in reality, they seek license.

"They hypocritically bar Communists from their membership, but they seek to discredit all persons who abhor Communists and communism . . . they launch attacks against Congressional legislation designed to curb communism.

"Sadly, the cult of the pseudo-liberal, which is anything but liberal, continues to float about in the pink-tinted atmosphere of patriotic irresponsibility. . . . Every pseudo-liberal in this country should look inside his heart and give heed to the destruction he may be bringing upon the very country that permits him to enjoy this very freedom of thought."—Ed.

What Shall the Church Do?

WILLIAM H. BECKMANN

Sometimes it appears that the Church is being prostituted for purposes that were not given to it by its Lord. These may even be questionable ones, but most often they are good and things with which any Christian should concern himself. But Christ, the head of the Church, has given it a purpose which ought to occupy all its time. And any purposes other than the one only serve to divert its attention. It is true, there are various ways by which the Church's aim can be served, but becoming involved in those things which have only a remote connection, if any, with the Church's chief end must be avoided. There are many persons who consider themselves to be "working for the Church," yet who have never thought of making disciples for Jesus Christ and teaching them all he has commanded. The reason may lie in the fact that there are so many names on the church roll who have no real conception of what it means to be a Church member, a part of the Body of Christ.

MAKING DISCIPLES

It is the Church's definite responsibility to make disciples and to teach them all the things that Jesus commanded. Is there any other agency, institution, or organization in this world charged with that responsibility? The truth is that it is the business of the Church to make new men, or rather to lend itself to the Lord so that he can make new men through it. Only new men can and will walk in the new ways of life that the Church ought to set before them. We must note that it is the "disciples" who are to be taught to obey Jesus' commands, not men everywhere who probably do not know Jesus as Lord. We must remember that the Epistles were addressed to the Church, the society of the redeemed. And in one sense Christ's parable of the wineskins applies here. How foolish it is to attempt to force a man to walk a new, more noble way of life when he is still a slave to sin. Such men cannot be made to do moral good by law or love their brethren by law. Now the Church is a society within a society. The Church is in the world, but is not to be of the world.

W. H. Beckmann is a native of Georgia and a graduate of Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur. He is Pastor of Red Bank Presbyterian Church in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Yet, if it remains true to its Lord, it can have a profound effect upon the world. Christians, living Christian lives, can be "light"; they can be "salt"; and their community will feel their presence. Society's conduct will be influenced by them, indirectly if not directly.

We must confess, however, that the failure of members to live the life that the Church proclaims is a serious drawback to the work of extending the Kingdom. Evidently the mass of Church members do not yet realize they are Christ's chief witness in the world. The Church is supposed to be made up of those who have been redeemed by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and whose lives have been transformed by his power. That the true (invisible) and the apparent (visible) church are not one and the same is sadly and only too obvious.

At present, the church, as an earthly organization, cannot decide what its mission in the world is. One of the mistakes that we have often made is that what the Church will do is determined largely by what is expected of it. Now, it is true that human institutions must often change as circumstances vary; in fact, their whole purposes may have to be altered due to external conditions. But this is not so with the Church. The Church is not a human institution governed by the laws and purposes of men. It has one head, one law-giver, and one resolve. Now some men in the Church have appeared to assume these powers themselves, and this is unfortunate, even tragic. However, the fact that some will, out of vanity or ignorance, take these things into their hands in no wise affects the truth that they belong only in the hands of God.

What then constitutes the role of the Church as far as the serious problems that face our nation and world are concerned? Does it have a word to speak, a witness to give? And what is the manner in which it is going to perform these tasks? Many are the answers being put forward, both by those within the Church and those without; and this is the reason so many are so confused. Both conflicting leadership and a lack of understanding on the part of church members are obscuring the purpose which God has for his Church in this world.

We must note the fact, too, that the Church does

not really belong to this world. Surely it is in the world, but not of the world. And just so far as the Church becomes a part of the world, so far does it cease to be the Church. This is true despite the urging of those who claim that the Church should be a part of the community. (There is indeed something anomalous in the very term "community church.")

SPEAKING TO THE TIMES

Certainly the Church must put its message in the language of time and place if it is to reach people. It rightly offers temporal aids—the Church must deal with the whole man, and the soul can only be reached as it lives in the body. But in no way does this mean that its message can be altered or its purpose modified. The Church (and this means the members that make it up) needs to remember God's admonition through Paul (as Phillips translates it): "Don't let the world around you squeeze you into its own mold . . ." Rom. 12:2a).

The "voice" of the Church is to remind the New Israel of its sins and to call God's people to a life that becomes the followers of Jesus Christ. It is to remind them that their reconciliation with God depends upon a firm faith (not a shifting away) in the hope of the Gospel. And it is to bring to their attention constantly Jesus' own words, "If you keep my commandments, you shall abide in my love" (John 15:10).

And while the "voice" of the Church calls its members, yea, insists that they follow Christ in their daily lives, the word to those outside can only be, and must be, "Come to Christ." The Church must not forget nor forsake the revelation of God that the great need of all men is to come to Jesus Christ in surrender and to receive him as Saviour and Lord.

THREE PITFALLS

In our day, and in any day for that matter, the Church must especially beware of three pitfalls: (1) Misleading men, or supporting those who do mislead people into thinking that the Church is an agency for securing certain rights or temporal benefits for men; (2) Lending itself as a pressure force upon the state to bring about reforms needed and even desirable from the Christian viewpoint; and (3) Confronting unregenerate men with a regenerate pattern of life and expecting them to walk in it.

PERIL OF MISLEADING MEN

The Church must beware lest it deceive or mislead men. In supporting the cause of minority or suppressed groups, the Church must take heed lest it attract those who see in it only a champion for their temporal rights. Christ was rejected because he insisted on holding true to his mission to free men from the tyranny of themselves rather than some external

oppressor. Israel desired that God set them free from every form of earthly tyranny and oppression. But God had not freed Israel from Egypt simply that they might enjoy the "four freedoms." The word of the Lord to Pharaoh was "Let my people go, that they may serve me" (Ex. 8:1; 9:1; 3:19; 4:23; 5:1).

We must remember that Christ did not come offering to remove all of men's troubles. Rather, he warns those who truly seek to follow him to expect trouble in this world. "If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hates you" (John 15:19). "In the world you have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (John 16:33). Jesus admonishes us to enter the narrow gate, to travel the hard way; it is the only one that leads to life (Matt. 7:13).

Now someone may remind us that on Jesus' first appearance in public ministry (according to Luke), he said that the portion of Scripture he had read was fulfilled. This was the portion: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has appointed me to preach the good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (4:18, 19). But who among us takes this to read in its literal sense? Certainly not all the blind were healed in Jesus' day, nor all the slaves freed, nor all the poor enriched. And he did not mean this in its literal sense to be the purpose of his Church. Indeed, our Lord rebuked those who followed him with the hope of receiving temporal benefits. He made it clear that he offered men the Bread of Heaven and there was no place in his Kingdom for those who sought only earthly bread—after which most of those who had been following Jesus left him (John 6). Is the Church today afraid to speak the truth because its proclamation will turn many away?

NOT A POWER LOBBY

With regard to the second pitfall mentioned above, the Church cannot lend itself as a power lobby to bring pressure on the state. There is grave danger that in joining human agencies to support actions in the community at large (which we must admit is composed mainly of unregenerate men, or certainly of men little concerned with the will of God), the Church will play false even to those it professes to help. People will thus receive a wrong conception of the Church's true purpose according to Jesus Christ, and for man, this will be travesty and indeed tragedy.

Is not the declaration of the Confession of Faith still the best rule for the Church? Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs

which concern the commonwealth unless the way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate (Chap. 33, IV).

DILUTING THE CHALLENGE

Furthermore, we may well ask that when the Church by its actions aligns itself with unregenerate "socializers," no matter how good may seem their aims, is it not forgetting God's warning about being unequally yoked together with unbelievers? Some may scoff at the thought that Paul's admonition has any bearing here. But we must face his question: "What communion has light with darkness?" Can it be that the path by which the Church becomes "of the world" is that of aligning itself with secular and non-Christian agencies in the promotion of "good" causes?

Many may vociferously deny this, but even in participation in Brotherhood Week the Church has sometimes weakened its own witness. All men are not brothers *in the most important sense*. Surely Christians ought to be willing to associate and to cooperate with non-Christians. Christians must not look down upon others. But those who do not own Christ as Saviour and Lord are lost, and anything that we do to weaken our witness of this fact is unfair to our "brethren" who are not in Christ.

We have hereto covered the question of calling unregenerate men to walk in a regenerate pattern of conduct. But let the Church remember that its message to those outside Christ is the call to come to him in surrender of life and in accepting the difficulties of true Christian living for his sake. And let the Church remember that this is its message to all the unredeemed, oppressed and oppressor alike. Christ still says to men today, "Come to me . . . Take my yoke upon you . . . learn from me . . . You must be born again . . . Deny yourself and take up your cross and follow me." Christ is the head, and the Church is his body.

LET THE CHURCH BE HERSELF

To be sure, the cry is raised that the Church must take its stand on issues facing our world today. But who says so?

During the last great war one wise churchman even suggested that even in time of war the Church has something more important to consider. Does not the Church have something more important to say and do today than become involved in the petty issues of the hour? (In the light of eternity, which of our disturbing issues is not petty?)

Surely Christian citizens as individuals must take the lead in seeing there is righteousness and justice in their governments, and as individuals exercise and fulfill their responsibility wherever it may fall. But who

says the Church as such must do this? Does the Lord of the Church command it? And who or what is "the Church" that must do this? Who is to decide on which side the Church will take its stand? Do not the teachings of the Lord of the Church rather cut right across the issues and those who are in conflict over them?

A most important question for us is: Do we really believe that we today are wiser than the devoted Christians of yesterday? (The writer confesses he has met some who feel they have a better understanding of God's will than had Peter or Paul, and much more than the writers of the Confession of Faith!) Of course, there are those with ready answers for all these questions. Perhaps we should respect their integrity and sincerity, but to accept their judgments and follow their lead is another matter. We must remember that even in these matters "there is a way which seemeth right to a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" (Prov. 14:12).

END



Preacher in the Red

WHO'S WHO

WE HAD BEEN expecting a missionary from Colombia, a Latin-American whom none of us had seen before. So when he arrived, my wife ushered him into the parsonage of our Chinese church and called me in the church office on the extension phone.

Before I could reach home, a young man from our downtown metropolitan neighborhood, somewhat under the influence of alcohol, came to the door. Thinking that perhaps the missionary could help the man, my wife led him into the living room.

"Oh," exclaimed the astonished missionary, looking from one person to the other and obviously expecting to greet the pastor. "How—how are you, my—my brother!"

My wife scarcely had time to clarify the situation when I burst into the house. Looking forward to meeting a missionary, I was taken aback at the swaggering figure who dominated the scene.

"Hello!" I gasped. "What can I do for you—and your friend?"

There were three red faces—that of the alcoholic, the missionary and also his confused host.—The Rev. HONG C. SUI, Houston, Texas.

.....

For each report by a minister of the Gospel of an embarrassing moment in his life, CHRISTIANITY TODAY will pay \$5 (upon publication). To be acceptable, anecdotes must narrate factually a personal experience, and must be previously unpublished. Contributions should not exceed 250 words, should be typed double-spaced, and bear the writer's name and address. Upon acceptance, such contributions become the property of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Address letters to: Preacher in the Red, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Suite 1014 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

Cross or Crescent in Africa?

BEN J. MARAIS

Early in its history, Islam had had contacts with Africa. When the Islamic religion made its great sweep in the course of the seventh century, it moved across North Africa, sweeping everything before it from the Nile Delta to Gibraltar. It even crossed Gibraltar into Spain and across the Pyrenees into France. That year, 732 A.D., when the spearheads of Islam were blunted by Charles Martel at Tours, was one of the great hours of Europe and Christendom.

This sweep of Islam across North Africa, at the time the North African church collapsed like a house of cards, still puzzles us in many ways. Even today it makes strange reading. Why should groups of Christians in North Africa have welcomed the armies of Islam to their cities? Could they not realize what it would mean? What did they hope to gain through the Islamic conquests? Why exactly did this great North African Church of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine meet disaster and ignominy in this way? Why was it almost completely swept from the face of the earth with the exception of a few isolated Christian groups like the present day Copts of Egypt or the Abyssinians?

SOME REASONS FOR CATASTROPHE

No single reason explains this vast catastrophe in one of the most promising areas of early Christendom. From a political standpoint, we can ascribe some of Islam's early success to the fact that it moved into the vast power vacuum left after the enervating struggles between the Roman and Persian empires. This set the stage for the armies of Islam to sweep onward without any real opposition. It was like the opening of great flood gates over a vast flat land. Islamic armies were actually able to move for thousands of miles before they were blunted at Tours in France. But this factor in itself does not explain the favorable reaction which the North African church had toward the invasion.

Why did sections of the North African church lit-

erally welcome the armies of Islam as if they had come as liberators? Why did they not realize that for them this was the beginning of the end? The church of Origen, Cyprian and Augustine was to tumble into ruin.

It is sometimes said that the church failed to prevent calamity because it did not do missionary work. Up to a point this may be true, but it does not seem to be the basic reason. More probably the church in North Africa failed because it did not become indigenous. It failed to become a part of the very life of the people. It was too much of a Roman and Roman-controlled church for North Africans. And because the native peoples of North Africa hated Rome, the Roman-controlled church failed to win their deepest loyalties.

These people had had many grievances against Rome. We need only think of the vast system of absentee land ownership through which Romans owned large tracts of North African land. The local populations detested this system and everything that went with it. And when Islam moved in, some groups—even Christian ones—welcomed it as a liberator against Romanism.

What made this invasion worse was the fact that as soon as Islam moved in, the Roman Christians in North Africa moved out and went back to Sicily and Italy. The North African church was thus left in a sad plight and could in no way face up to the victorious onrush of Islam.

A MOSLEM STRONGHOLD

Soon the vast stretches of North Africa, from Egypt to Gibraltar, were part of the new Moslem world. Today, after 12 centuries, Africa is still spiritually part and parcel of the world of Islam, although most of these regions have become independent states again or colonies of European powers like France or Spain. This vast area where the church of Augustine once flourished is now an almost solid and unbroken Moslem stronghold. Christian missions, which are few and far between, have made little impression.

The North African church was not so much destroyed by the sword of Islam as it was bled white through isolation from the main streams of Christianity. As a matter of fact, the church acquired some freedom under Islam, but a very restricted freedom; it was not

Ben J. Marais is Professor of the History of Christianity in the University of Pretoria, South Africa. He is a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa. Some of his graduate study was pursued at Princeton and Yale. Of his writings, some have been translated into English. Among these is *Colour—Unsolved Problem of the West*.

allowed to expand under Islamic rule and lost contact with the rest of Christendom. For this reason, it slowly became exhausted. Today the remaining Christian groups in these areas represent almost petrified forms of Christianity. The victory of Islam was, to all practical purposes, complete.

From bases in Europe, the Christian church tried in succeeding centuries to reconquer Islamic North Africa. We need only mention the name of that great man and indefatigable fighter for the Cross, Raymond Lull, the Spaniard from Majorca, who made three journeys to North Africa and ultimately was stoned to death not far from the coasts of the Mediterranean. A great man of letters and a hero for the Cross, he confronted the Moslems with the challenge of Christianity and tried through argument to convince them.

Today it is often said that Lull's method was not the most fruitful. On the other hand our failure through current methods to convert Moslems should make us less dogmatic in judging Lull and his methods. This lone man made a magnificent effort to take the message of the Cross back to Africa.

ISLAM IN AFRICA TODAY

What are the relative positions of Christianity and Islam in Africa today? There is no doubt that Islam is still ascendant. But Christianity is also progressing at a very hopeful tempo.

As things stand today, one out of every three Africans is a Moslem. Because almost all the inhabitants of vast tracts of Africa are Moslems, it is relatively easy to make a fair estimate of their number in Africa. By general agreement Islam has from 65 to 70 million African adherents. More than 90 per cent of the African Moslems live north of the equator, but at many points the southward movement of Islam has crossed the equator. In most parts of southern Africa, however, Islam is limited to small groups of settlers especially from India. And in other areas we find Moslem communities like the Malays in Cape Town.

Events in North Africa, Egypt, the Nile Delta and the Middle East, however, all point to new life in Islam. The Moslem world is once more self-conscious and on the move. Missionaries and Western agencies find it increasingly difficult to continue work. The resurgence of Islam coupled with anti-Western sentiments are creating ever more formidable barriers in the path of Christian missions.

For generations we Western Christians have become accustomed to the fact that the nominally Christian nations of Europe or the West were the masters of the world, the great powers who controlled the masses of Asia, the Near East or Africa. Ours was the religion of the conquering West, of Western man, the rulers of the world. Up to a point this world situation favored

Christian missions. We had open doors with at least a minimum of protection. Through hospitals, schools and other Christian agencies, we were in a position to help and influence and befriend these peoples.

THE WEST IS LOSING FACE

But how rapidly this world picture changes! The West is losing face. Asia, as well as Africa, is on the move. Varied forms of nationalism and Communism are rapidly changing the spiritual climate of these countries.

When our descendants look back someday on this second half of the twentieth century, they may call it one of the great liberating and creative periods in history. Many age old shackles will be broken. What the ultimate result of all these movements may be, we do not know; we cannot even make a useful guess. But one thing at least is certain. While vast changes and liberating movements on the economic and political fronts are being consummated, the Christian church in all these areas will be confronted by stormy weather. It may have to face trying times; great disappointments may be in store for Christian missions. All the political and economic changes in the Islamic and Communist world may have far-reaching repercussions among the indigenous peoples of Africa, and may temporarily, at least, create obstacles in the way of Christian missions.

CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA

How strong is Christianity in Africa today? If we take all types and groups of Christians into consideration and include also the 10 million Copts and Monophysites, the maximum number of Christians cannot be more than 30 million. For every Christian in Africa there are more than two Moslems. But every Christian church in Africa with which I am in touch is experiencing an upsurge of missionary fervor, and men are entering new fields of opportunity every day.

At the present time, all the material factors seem to favour Islam as the religion of Africa. But the day may yet come that Africa will be overshadowed by the cross of Christ. Christianity is making great strides. Its greatest problem, however, is as yet unsolved: How to create real deep community among different racial groups. If Christianity ultimately fails in this, it must fail to win the heart of Africa. For whether Christianity or Islam will be victorious in Africa may well depend on the solution of this problem. END

The Lantern

I walked in darkness through a twisted maze,
But He who made the garden knows each path
As every bird sings hymns of sounding praise
I walk in confidence . . . my lantern, faith.

MAUDE RUBIN

The Final Judgment

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Holy Scripture teaches definitely that as God is the Creator of all men, so also is he their final Judge who will reveal his omnipotent power and his saving grace especially on the last day in the presence of those who love him and those who do not.

The difficulty of the Bible student is not to find adequate Scripture proof for this doctrine, but to select from the many passages of Holy Writ witnessing to the final judgment, those which present the biblical teaching in its widest scope. Such a clear, full, and most convincing passage we have in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, where he writes: "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest thou up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. . . . In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel" (Rom. 2:5, 16).

Here, as in many other places in Scripture, the final judgment is ascribed to God who executes it by Jesus Christ, his divine Son. This agrees with the words of our Lord: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son" (John 5:22). Similarly the apostle declared at Athens on the Areopagus: "He [God] hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained" (Acts 17:31). The Redeemer of mankind will be also the final Judge of man. Indeed, the apostle predicates the final judgment directly of Christ when he writes: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ" (2 Cor. 5:10). The fact that the Father will judge the world by Jesus Christ mightily proves the deity of our divine Saviour, who is one with the Father and the Holy Spirit (John 10:30).

As Scripture in all its doctrines reveals to us only so much as is necessary for our salvation and never attempts to satisfy carnal man's vain curiosity by presenting needless details, so also it does in teaching the final judgment. It offers the sweetest comfort to all be-

J. Theodore Mueller has long been identified with the Systematic Theology Department at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. He has passed his 73rd birthday, but continues on modified professorial service. He and Mrs. Mueller observed their golden wedding anniversary on February 25. He was ordained by the Missouri Lutheran Church 50 years ago.

lievers and the most earnest warnings to all who reject Christ, but it always confines itself to what man must know to obtain everlasting life. Nor can human speculation supplement or clarify God's saving revelations on this important doctrine; they can only mislead and obscure. Luther, therefore, reminds his readers time and again that they must learn to adhere to the divine Word (*sich ans Wort halten*) and to desist from trying to fathom God by suggestions of human reason, since he cannot savingly be known outside his Word.

THE DAY OF THE FINAL JUDGMENT

As the Holy Scriptures declare, the final judgment will take place on a day definitely appointed by God. This revelation Paul by divine inspiration enlarges by adding that the resurrection of those asleep in Jesus and the transmutation of the living believers at Christ's second coming will occur "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (1 Cor. 15:52). Therefore, the final judgment, when the unrighteous "will go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal" (Matt. 25:46), is not a long, protracted process, but a momentary act of God when time will have been replaced by eternity. As with Christ's final triumphant coming, heaven and earth will pass away, so also time will then be no more. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up" (2 Pet. 3:10). Schelling's often quoted statement that the history of the world is also the world's judgment (*Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht*) contains a quantum of truth, but God's punitive judgment upon perverse nations in time is certainly not his final judgment at the end of time.

JUDGMENT AND RESURRECTION

At Christ's triumphant second coming all the dead will be raised and made to appear before his judgment seat. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations" (Matt. 25:31-32). In Matthew 25:31-46 the final judgment is described in detail. "Then shall

the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (v. 34). "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (v. 41).

Properly speaking, the final judgment will be executed only upon the unrighteous, in particular, upon those who have rejected the saving gospel of Christ, as he himself tells us: "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16). It is to the wicked only that the Lord will say: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," and it is only they that "shall go away into everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:41,46). Believers in Christ, placed on his right hand, will hear only words of praise and welcome (v. 34) and will "go away into life eternal."

HELL NOT INTENDED FOR MAN

On the day of the final judgment the divine Judge will command the unrighteous to depart into everlasting fire "prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41). Therefore hell, the everlasting fire, has been prepared only for the devil and his angels and not for fallen men. Since Christ is the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29) and has atoned for the sins of all men by his vicarious, substitutionary death (2 Cor. 5:19-21), heaven stands open to all who by faith accept his divine redemption (Matt. 11:28). Of course, those who reject the Gospel will be damned, but through their own fault (Hos. 13:9). "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18).

As the believers in Christ will not be condemned (John 3:18), so also the holy angels will be free from the final judgment. They will rather aid their and our divine Lord in executing the final judgment (Matt. 25:31). Scripture does not reveal in what way this will be done, and so we must leave also this question to the many other details which now we are unable to know.

SEEMINGLY CONTRADICTIONARY PASSAGES

There are passages in Scripture which declare emphatically that believers in Christ will not be judged. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life" (John 5:24). On the other hand, there are passages which warn Christians most earnestly against falling from grace and becoming subject to the final judgment: "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. 10:12). Most earnestly the Holy Spirit addresses us especially in such passages as Heb. 3:7-19; 6:4-6; 10:

26-31; 12:14-17 and others. Scripture also warns us by many examples of persons who did not remain faithful to Christ such as Judas and Demas.

There is, however, no real discrepancy between these seemingly contradictory passages. Such passages as promise believers eternal life without judgment are pure Gospel, addressed to them according to their "new man" or to them as a "new creation" in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17). Again, those passages threatening believers with judgment, are addressed to their "old man" or to their "corrupt nature," which does not do God's will (Rom. 7:14-24; Gal. 5:16-21). It is in this sense that the Holy Spirit warned the seven churches in Asia: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches: To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God" (Rev. 2:7).

All Scripture passages, warning Christians or admonishing them, belong to the category of the Law. It is true, the believer as a believer does not need the Law, but only the Gospel (Gal. 5:22-24). However, inasmuch as the believer is still burdened with the "flesh" or corrupt nature, he needs also the Law (Gal. 5:24-26). Thus the Christian, being divided between two times—the earthly and the heavenly, needs the Law to restrain his flesh and the Gospel to comfort his spirit. The paradox of Law and Gospel finds its explanation in the believer's paradox of flesh and spirit, and to this twofold nature the merciful God appeals at the same time by the Law and the Gospel (Rom. 7:25).

THE GROUND FOR FINAL JUDGMENT

As the ground for final judgment, Scripture stresses the deeds which men have done in their earthly life. St. Paul writes: "Who [God] will render to every man according to his deeds" (Rom. 2:6). More specifically the apostle affirms: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every man may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10). The works of men attest their attitude toward Christ, as our Lord himself states when condemning the unrighteous: "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me" (Matt. 25:45). Deeds are manifestations of either unbelief or faith and so demonstrate either man's rejection or his acceptance of Christ: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me" (Matt. 25:40).

Of course, many heathen did not have the Gospel and so could not know of Christ, the divine Saviour of the world. Nevertheless, "the judgment of God is according to truth" (Rom. 2:2), that is, according to justice. Just how God's judgment will be according to justice, the apostle explains very clearly when he says: "For as many as have sinned without law [i.e., without

the revealed Law] shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law" (Rom. 2:12). The heathen who did not have the saving gospel of Christ's redemption, though knowing God, "glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" and "changed the truth of God into a lie" (Rom. 1:21-25). Hence even the pagan idolaters must acknowledge God's righteous judgment on the last day, for they will be judged by the law of God which they had, but rejected, "so that they are without excuse" (v. 20).

So far as believers are concerned, their failings and shortcomings will not be mentioned at all in the final judgment, for God "will cast all their sins into the depths of the sea" (Micah 7:19). Instead, the divine Judge will enumerate only their good works: "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in" (Matt. 25:35). That, too, is pure gospel preaching which the believer must not misuse to his eternal harm by permitting his corrupt nature to sin against grace. Nevertheless, Christ's declarations definitely prove that true believers will not "come into judgment" on the last day (John 5:24).

FINAL JUDGMENT DETERMINED

With the final judgment, the destiny of both believers and unbelievers will be unalterably determined, for each class of men will then be assigned to their final, everlasting abode: "life eternal" or "everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:46). The Greek original does not make the distinction between the modifiers "everlasting" and "eternal" which we find in the King James Version, but uses the same adjective *aiōnios* to describe both the never-ending bliss of the righteous and the never-ending punishment of the ungodly. All attempts at explaining the everlasting punishment of the wicked as "annihilation," fail in view of the clear and unmistakable Scripture passages which do teach the everlasting damnation of the unrighteous.

Unbelievers may scorn this Scripture teaching, but it comes from the infallible lips of the Son of God, our Redeemer, whose Word is truth. The doctrine of the final judgment, of course, is severe Law preaching, designed to terrify the wicked and also to warn believers inasmuch as they still are "flesh." In view of the final judgment and the everlasting punishment of the unrighteous, believers should "work out their salvation with fear and trembling" (Phil. 2:12), trusting at the same time in the divine promise that "it is God who works in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (v. 13).

With the final judgment the world will have come to

its end, for the day of the final judgment will be the last day (John 6:44). Paul writes: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power" (1 Cor. 15:24). In place of this sin-cursed earth there will be a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness (2 Pet. 3:13). Whether the passages predicting the end of this world and the new heaven and earth declare its renovation or its total annihilation has been a matter of discussion among theologians, for some Bible verses seem to speak of a renovation of this present world, while others undeniably assert its annihilation. But all exegetes are agreed on the apostle's inspired teaching that "the fashion of this world passeth away" (1 Cor. 7:31). The new heaven and the new earth, no matter of what nature it may be, will be the believers' everlasting home of glory, happiness and perfection, where God will wipe away all tears from their eyes" (Rev. 7:9-17).

LEADS TO SALVATION

Mockery is not the answer to the Christian doctrine of the final judgment. That was heard already when Peter proclaimed God's final wrath and judgment upon the ungodly world of his day (2 Pet. 3:4). The Holy Spirit has graciously revealed this doctrine to men in order that they might seek the eternal life which Christ has prepared for all sinners and which they may now receive by grace through faith in Christ, the divine Redeemer of the world. The doctrine of the final judgment should cause the sinner to flee to the Son of God for salvation.

NOT THE CENTRAL DOCTRINE

The doctrine of final judgment is an important teaching of Christian theology and, in addition, a very fair teaching, by which the divine Judge frankly and mercifully foretells what he will do to all who reject his divine Gospel. Nevertheless, it is not the central message of the Bible. The central proclamation of God's Word is the blessed Gospel tidings: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). Those who accept this comforting Gospel truth of divine love do not fear the final judgment, but rather "look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working, whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:20-21).

"For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." (2 Cor. 6:2)

END

Christian Experience and Psychology

BERNARD RAMM

It is not unusual for a sensitive Christian student to be deeply troubled upon first exposure to psychological studies in religion. Religious experience is made to appear as either the result of some inward combination of feelings, urges and tensions, or as the product of social conditioning. Case histories and tables of statistics seem to support the contention that religious experience is merely another human experience upon which no claims can be made for the realities discussed.

Whether it be a study of adolescent crises and conversion, of fear and religious commitment, or of mania and religious delusion, the question must be asked: Can psychology determine truth in religious experience? Or the question may be put more simply: Can a psychologist completely explain religious experience as some sort of natural product of the human being, or is there something about religious experience which necessarily escapes the psychologist?

The Christian view to this matter is that although we learn much from studies of the psychology of religion, true religious experience cannot be explained as a completely human affair.

THE PROBLEM OF TRUTH

The first reason for our position is this: *psychology cannot settle the problem of truth.*

A psychologist proposes to make assertions which he deems as true, or at least provisionally true. But the procedure of determining the truth of a statement is not psychological but philosophical. The psychologist intends to make assertions which may be classed as knowledge-statements. But the criteria for discriminating knowledge-statements from false statements is again philosophical and not psychological.

Therefore, any and all psychologists have to presume a theory of truth and knowledge. Some do this critically and philosophically, as Clark Hull; others naively imitate theories of truth and knowledge familiar to them through their teachers or textbooks.

Furthermore, the psychologist likes to think he is a scientist and employs the scientific method. But there are many debatable assertions in the scientific method, and many assumptions, none of which are capable of psychological verification. Perhaps a simple illustration can clear up this point. A psychologist may explain how a child learns that two and two are four, and he may discover a more efficient method of teaching this to him. But what psychological experiment could ever prove that two and two make four? Such proof is the province of mathematical logic.

Whether it be a study of adolescent crises and conversion, of fear and religious commitment, or of mania and religious delusion, the question must be asked: Can psychology determine truth in religious experience? Or the question may be put more simply: Can a psychologist completely explain religious experience as some sort of natural product of the human being, or is there something about religious experience which necessarily escapes the psychologist?

BEYOND CLINICAL SCOPE

Therefore, *truth-claims made in the field of religious experience and realities claimed as existing therein cannot be settled by psychology alone.* A psychologist may indicate that a certain religious person is psychotic, and we would be quick to discount such a person's religious experience (although it is well to consider Kierkegaard's warning that in a world of fallen men a truly religious person must of necessity be abnormal). James and Starbuck, Leuba and Freud, Johnson and Jung may teach us much about the reasons for unusual religious behaviour; clinical psychologists, psychiatrists and industrial counselors may parade before us the distressing alliance of certain mental disorders and religious experiences or adolescent psychology and conversions; but this in no way settles the truth-claims of religion.

Psychology cannot settle the problem of truth and knowledge; that is the province of philosophy.

INADEQUATE EXPLANATION

Further, *an act of God on the soul will have a psychological result on the believer, but a study of this result cannot completely explain the experience.*

It is the constant assertion of Scripture that when God acts on the soul, the soul has a concrete religious experience. The soul may praise God, sing to God, worship God, consecrate itself to God, repent before God or even, Jonah-like, flee from God. In any God-created religious experience, there will be changes in the believer's moral and spiritual life. These reactions of the soul can be "public property" in a sense, either through observation or by confession of the

believer. And as such, they may become matters of psychological study.

The religious person may be studied physiologically, psychologically and sociologically. Such a study may in some instances create valid suspicion over the integrity of his religious experience (e.g., in cases where a person who claims divine healing has his old ailment return in force). But if someone's experience is the result of the action of the Holy Spirit, then a physiological-psychological-sociological study cannot give us *all* the facts. For the most important fact of all, the Holy Spirit himself, is not within grasp of the psychologist. The issue still remains, an act of God cannot be settled on psychological grounds. As Bavinck has correctly said, "History and psychology can only *exhibit* religious phenomena. They cannot *evaluate* them" (*The Doctrine of God*, p. 76, italics his).

NOT SUBJECT TO TEST

Again, *no psychological tests can be made of religious truth*. Scripture informs us that it is sin to tempt God. A controlled experiment to test spiritual truth is tempting God. As a Christian psychologist has well said, a psychiatric hospital could not be divided into two parts, half the patients being prayed for and the other half receiving mental treatment, and the authorities expecting at the end of their "experiment" to discover a correlation, or lack of it, between prayer results and mental healing. That would be tempting God. Neither could one twin be baptized and the other not for the purpose of serving as a "control group."

The possibility of experimentation with spiritual truth is out of the question. "In no laboratory can we reproduce the situation in which a man is experiencing the impact of the Holy Spirit," writes J. G. McKenzie. "We cannot stage either the conviction of sin or the forgiveness of sin" (*Psychology, Psychotherapy, and Evangelicalism*, p. 44).

SPIRITUAL ORDER UNIQUE

The spiritual order does not operate like the material order. A lack of proper evidence can doom a material hypothesis, but in the spiritual order apparent inactivity of God (as in the case of Habakkuk), or suffering (Job), or severe testing (Abraham), or even death itself (Jesus Christ) does not count against spiritual truth. God's actions in developing a man's spiritual character are often beyond our understanding.

One of the old chestnuts from logic books is the story of a hen. For one thousand days the farmer fed this hen faithfully. According to the law of uniformity, the chicken assumed the hypothesis that it would be fed thus another thousand days. But on day number 1001, the chicken's head was lopped off. The chicken had confused the material order with the personal order,

and in its confusion lost its head!

Enthusiastic Christians who would seek confirmation of Christianity out of the latest works on mental health ought to be restrained. Many eminent figures of the Bible were what they were because they were not conformed to patterns of mental hygiene! We must restrain the psychologist who would sin in tempting God through experimentation on spiritual truth.

THE LIMITS OF PSYCHOLOGY

The actions of God on the human soul are through the Holy Spirit, and are therefore mysterious.

Our Lord taught Nicodemus (John 3) that the actions of the Holy Spirit were *mysterious* and *real*. The Spirit produces a real work in regeneration. As we know the wind blows, we know that the Spirit works. Just as the motions of the wind are invisible at night (for Nicodemus came by night), so the motions of the Holy Spirit are real though mysterious.

It is this mysteriousness that sets limits to the psychology of religion. A psychologist may study a man's conversion, but not his regeneration; he may study the human spirit, but not the divine Spirit. To get *all* the data about one's spiritual experiences, an investigator must include the actions of the Holy Spirit which is precisely what he cannot do.

GOD-CENTERED APPROACH

Finally, *the biblical approach to religious experience is God-centered.*

According to Scripture, true religious experience is the result of Holy Spirit action on the human soul. And the emphasis falls more on God who creates the experience than on man who has it. There are touching and moving spiritual experiences reflected in the Psalms, but even so the eye of the Psalmist is fixed intently upon God. The important matter in Scripture is not that man experiences, but that God acts. The critical question, then, is that of the reality of God, and not the peculiarity of experience.

Thus the emphasis in Scripture is upon the Spirit who creates experience. David's great cry, "take not thy Holy Spirit from me" (Ps. 51:11) has nothing to do with our modern debates on the admissibility of salvation, but has everything to do with the Holy Spirit as creator of genuine spiritual experiences.

TWO HEALTHY EMPHASES

A healthy theology will assert two things in regard to psychology:

First, that all efforts of psychologists to explain away religious experience must be resisted. Christianity is grounded in the self-revelation of God given to man, and does not hang on the slender thread of religious experience. Psychologists of (Cont'd on p. 22)

Bible Text of the Month

Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled (Matthew 5:6).

¶ The end which all healthy religious striving proposes to itself, is to attain this righteousness in fellowship with God; and it can be perfectly realized only when the will is entirely united with God. This condition of perfect oneness of will with God is essential to full self-contentment, that is, blessedness. Therefore, when this righteousness is attained, then, and not till then, will perfect blessedness enter. A. THOLUCK

¶ Because man had perfect righteousness before the fall, he enjoyed perfect blessedness. If you and I shall, by divine grace, attain to blessedness hereafter, it will be because God has restored us to righteousness. As it was in the first paradise, so must it be in the second—righteousness is essential to the blessedness of man. We cannot be truly happy and live in sin. Holiness is the natural element of blessedness; and it can no more live out of that element than a fish could live in the fire. The happiness of man must come through his righteousness: his being right with God, with man, with himself—indeed, his being right all round. CHARLES SPURGEON

SPIRITUAL APPETITES

¶ Hunger and thirst are appetites that return frequently, and call for fresh satisfactions; so these holy desires rest not in anything attained, but are carried out toward renewed pardons, and daily fresh supplies of grace. The quickened soul calls for constant meals of righteousness, grace to do the work of every day in its day, as duly as the living body calls for food. MATTHEW HENRY

¶ Hunger and thirst are the strongest of all our bodily appetites. In like manner this hunger in the soul, this thirst after the image of God, is the strongest of all our spiritual appetites, when it is once awakened in the heart: yea, it swallows up all the rest in that one great desire, to be renewed after the likeness of him that created us. From the time we begin to hunger and thirst, those appetites do not cease, but are more and more craving, till we either eat and drink, or die. JOHN WESLEY

¶ Where the healthful appetite after righteousness is defectively developed in Christian life through undue brooding over faults or nursing of despondent grief, there Christianity grows pale-complex-

ioned, sickly, and womanish. There needs the irrepressible hunger to be and to do what is right, in order that a man may be maintained in the activities of spiritual manhood; and this desire, when inspired with promises of success and ardent through high enthusiasm, grows into a holy ambition, a noble and eager daring, covetous of the best gifts. . . . It is true that there is still pain in such hunger and thirst of the soul. Man never attains his moral ideal. Dissatisfaction with himself is, in fact, the root of spiritual desire; and here, as in all desire unaccomplished, there must be pain. J. OSWALD DYKES

¶ Many there be who are most anxious to please God and make conscience of all known sins, yet find in themselves so much darkness of mind, activity of rebellious corruption, forwardness in their affections, perverseness in their wills, yea, a constant proneness to all manner of sins; and, on the contrary, they can perceive so little of the fruits of sanctification, so little evidence of spiritual life, so few signs of divine grace at work within, that they often seriously doubt if they have received any grace at all. This is a fearfully heavy burden, and greatly casts down the soul. But here is divine consolation. Christ pronounces "blessed" not those who are full of righteousness, but those who hunger and thirst after it. Those who mourn over their depravity, who grieve over the plague of their hearts, who yearn for conformity to Christ—using the means constantly—are accepted of God in Christ. A. W. PINK

RIGHTEOUSNESS

¶ By "righteousness" is meant *piety towards God, vital religion, godliness*. By a starving man nothing is accounted of any value, in comparison with that which will satisfy the cravings of hunger. How rich then and precious the promise to such, as are hungering and thirsting after righteousness that their spiritual wants shall be supplied and that they shall be filled with that for which they are so earnestly longing. JOHN J. OWEN

¶ The metaphorical meaning of the verbs is that of longing desires. The righteousness is the establishment of which was the aim of Christ's work, and the condition of participation in the Mes-

siah's kingdom. They will obtain righteousness in full measure, namely, in being declared righteous (Rom. 5:19; Gal. 5:5), at the judgment of the Messiah (Matt. 25:34) and then live in perfect righteousness, so that God will be all in all (I Cor. 15:28). H. A. W. MEYER

GIFT OF GOD

¶ No willing and running, no laboring chase after it in our own strength and in our own way, attains unto righteousness: ours is to desire it; it is for God to give it. RUDOLF STIER

¶ There is a negative kind of holiness, which is neither pleasing to God nor profitable to man: it consists merely in an abstinence from open sin, and a discharge of external duties. But real holiness pervades the whole man: it comprehends the whole circle of divine graces: it reaches to the thoughts and desires of the heart; and assimilates us to God in all his communicable perfections. Now this is that which the true Christian shall be filled: in all his dispositions towards God and man, he shall be changed: he shall not only be delivered from all that would injure his character among men, but shall be "transformed into the very image of his God in righteousness and true holiness." CHARLES SIMEON

¶ He that gave the thirst likewise provides the water, and the one exactly meets the other. It is not the will of our heavenly Father that any longing in our hearts, prompted by himself, and therefore sincerely seeking him, shall perish unsatisfied. A satisfying righteousness therefore must be provided for the people of God. And it must be provided outside of us. To eat means to be nourished from without. Since the sinner is devoid of all righteousness, it is self-evident, that the source of his supply must be sought beyond the confines of his own evil and empty nature. For it to be otherwise would mean that hunger could be stilled with hunger. Our Lord's meaning obviously is that the coming order of things, the new kingdom of God, brings with itself, chief of all blessings, a perfect righteousness, as truly and absolutely the gift of God to man as is the Kingdom. GEERHARDUS VOS

¶ He hath also promised to fill the hungry with good things, to rain down righteousness on the dry and parched ground, to fulfil the desires of them that fear him. So that it is but our asking and his giving; our opening the mouth and he will fill it; our hungering and his feeding; our thirsting and his watering; our open hand and his open heart. JOHN TRAPP

EUTYCHUS and his kin

INCOGNITO CHORALES

One of my kin has furnished me with a page from the student newspaper of a metropolitan seminary featuring the words for a new hymn by an anonymous author. The writer, having learned of the success of Arius in popularizing his heresy in song, feels that his seminary should not lose this wide open opportunity to spread its theology.

Old Tune, New Sentiment

His contribution to a great new movement is set to the tune of "What a Friend We Have in Jesus," and begins:

"What a myth we have in Jesus
O how meaningful to me,
Existentially confronted
In artistic liturgy.
Though in life we often languish
Mid its ambiguity,
Jesus points to the solution,
Transcending all symbolically."

This may have to be taken with a grain of salt, but it suggests what some of these newer movements in theology could do for (or to) the grand old hymns.

Rosy-Tinted Lyrics

Something of the kind has been tried in the past; you may remember the rosy-tinted lyrics:

"Just as I am, young, strong and free,
To be the best that I can be
For truth, and righteousness and
Thee . . ."

This was substituted as a reversed version of the original:

"Just as I am, poor, wretched,
blind;
Sight, riches, healing of the mind,
Yea, all I need in Thee I find . . ."

Existential Replacements

Since this substitution was not very successful, perhaps my kin can provide more existential replacements. Contributors may become charter subscribers to my monthly choir collection, *Incognito Chorales*. You may have a paradoxology in mind, or perhaps you can add to such new numbers as:

"A critic snips the sacred page . . ."
"Angels, from the realms of story . . ."
"My hope is built on less and less . . ."

Psychotherapeutic psalmody is also desired; e.g., "Relax, my soul, calm every nerve." Address all entries to:

EUTYCHUS

ADVENTIST AVALANCHE

My confidence in your integrity has been justified. While I might have added a bit more context to a quotation or two and, while I obviously arrive at different conclusions than Mr. Lindsell (Mar. 31, Apr. 14 issues), I must say that he states the case with integrity and fairness.

HAROLD K. DAWSON

Alaska Mission of SDA
Ketchikan, Alaska

I found Mr. Lindsell's article . . . deeply stimulating and indicative of considerable personal research. I congratulate a man who will investigate for himself before making an evaluation.

Marinette, Wis.

A. D. CHILSON

Lindsell . . . rediscovered the great bond that marks us all as brethren—our failings.
SDA Church W. F. HADEL
Mountain Home, Ark.

How does he classify the churches who actively support religious legislation in the form of Sunday laws? Where does grace end and legalism begin for those who teach the sufficiency of Christ's death for man's salvation, but who also seek to legislate that same man (as well as unbelievers) into a religious observance of a day under the threat of civil penalties?

THEODORE CARCICH

Central Union Conference
Lincoln, Neb.

● A number of letters have made this point. If Sunday laws do represent legalism, it is here found in a far less crucial area than when ensconced in the doctrines of salvation.—Ed.

Our good friend . . . would have us believe that because a man is saved by grace he can go on breaking the law . . . I take my stand with John Wesley, Martin Luther, John Knox, and D. L. Moody who make clear . . . that the law of God written on two tables of stone will stand through . . . eternity.

Lethbridge, Alta.

R. SPANGLER

To the rich young ruler Christ said, ". . . If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." And it is unfortunate for

Brother Lindsell and his fellow anti-nomians that this statement relating commandment-keeping to entering into eternal life, cannot be credited to Ellen G. White.

Reseda, Calif.

WM. L. BUTLER

We . . . keep all ten of God's commandments (only by power of Christ) . . . We disagree . . . that a person can be saved, sanctified, backslidden, satisfied, and yet saved.

SDA Church

Bellingham, Wash.

E. E. WELLMAN

Could it possibly be that to qualify as an evangelical one must have a conscience that will permit him to knowingly disobey one of God's Ten Commandments? . . . We cannot be saved by merely keeping the commandments but we can be lost by breaking them.

San Jose, Calif.

ALFRED E. HOLST

I strenuously protest . . . "A man may be a genuine believer who believes in soul sleep . . ." How can one, who disbelieves what the master said to the dying thief.

D. J. EVANS

Christian & Missionary Alliance Church
Altoona, Pa.

I cannot teach my children, for whom I am responsible to God, that they are at liberty to set aside or try and change any or all or one of God's commandments . . .

Mrs. ROBERT N. BROWN
Glendale, Calif.

The SDA position on the Sabbath observance is utterly hopeless . . . However, SDA can still build around the person of Christ and by junking its errors find a place with other Christian communities.

JOHN F. COMO

St. Andrew's Episcopal
Port Angeles, Wash.

Is [the] child of God expected to obey God while growing up? And if so, is this not in some measure salvation by works?

Mr. Lindsell objects to the teaching of SDAs that disobedience to the command to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" might bar one from entrance into the kingdom of God. Should this be thought strange when . . . Paul . . . says

that adultery, idolatry, hatred, murder, drunkenness . . . will keep one out of the kingdom of God?

SDA Church
Vincennes, Ind. CLIFFORD M. BEE

What I want to know is: the seventh from what? Has anyone gone back to the year one and traced all the weeks down to present date, to be sure that we have the right days? If we part and go around the world in opposite directions—when we meet again one has gained a day and one lost a day; which day should be kept? When the day comes that we are known and do know, I will not be surprised to learn that I have been keeping, perhaps, Wednesday and the seventh-day people Tuesday.

Newfield, N. J. EATON R. BURROWS

Mr. Lindsell makes quite a to-do over the Sabbath question but that is nothing more than a smoke-screen for the real issue of the Calvinistic doctrine, "once saved always saved."

St. Simons Island, Ga. TED N. GRAVES

This statement . . . I cannot accept: "One acid test marks off Reformation theology from both sacramental theology and all other viewpoints. This has to do with soteriology. . . ." Reformation theology is sacramental theology as far as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are concerned.

ERNEST A. BERGESON
Peace Lutheran Church
Seattle, Wash.

We do believe in annihilation of the wicked (Mal. 4). We do believe that eternal torment is more in keeping with the character of Satan than of our merciful heavenly Father.

Williamstown, Vt. E. W. THURBER

I am an Adventist minister . . . I fail to see how one can read very much on any of these doctrines and not be convinced by the great amount of biblical evidence available to the earnest seeker.

Dinuba, Calif. R. H. KEZER

SDAs . . . just 2000 years behind the times.

Gordonville, Pa. MYER HESS

Dr. Lindsell . . . declares, "I know of no SDA literature that hints that Mrs. White was ever wrong." Allow me to refer Dr. Lindsell to the words of Mrs. White, "I had taken a wrong position," cited by Arthur G. Daniells, President of the SDA denomination from 1901 to 1922, in *The Abiding Gift of Prophecy*,

p. 327.

EDWIN R. THIELE
Emmanuel Missionary College
Berrien Springs, Mich.

● It is notable that the only charge of 'wrongness' adduced is one by Mrs. White herself. It would be of interest to know if this exhausts the list.—ED.

If God has spoken before—in Testament times—and he chooses to speak again in modern times, is it not possible that the authority of his latter communication is just as valid as the previous? . . . If Mrs. White . . . is in harmony with scriptural teaching, as SDAs believe she is, in dealing with vital scriptural doctrine, perhaps one had better be careful in denying a voice of authority in those areas in which she speaks which are not brought forward from definite scriptural statements . . .

The Sabbath . . . is a question as to the authority of Jehovah God versus Satan.

GERALD M. REYNOLDS
Howard University
Washington, D. C.

I have not been able to find that any appeal has been made to her [Mrs. White] writings in SDA doctrinal books to support the views now held by us.

EARNEST L. LUTZ, SR.
Loma Linda, Calif.

If to be evangelical one must believe that the gifts of the Spirit, one of which is prophecy by divine revelation, are not to be manifest, heeded or accepted, then SDAs cannot be evangelical and still have any reason for being SDAs.

Everett, Wash. DAVID L. BAUER

Why are the SDAs the only Sabbath-keeping group singled out and called "legalist"? You will find the answer to the question in Rev. 12:17 [And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed . . .].

Arlington, Calif. C. C. MORLAN

Significant is it to say that . . . Lindsell's article falls into two parts: a) Part II. SDA and the keeping of the commandments (i.e. "The Sabbath Test"). b) Part I. "Role of Ellen G. White" (i.e. the prophetic gift).

Did not Christ foretell, "war with the remnant (church) . . . which, a) keep the commandments of God, and b) have the testimony of Jesus Christ" Rev. 12:17. (The "testimony of Jesus" is "the Spirit of Prophecy" [Rev. 19:10] or the prophetic gift.) Certainly, "We have a more sure word of prophecy, etc." (II Pet.

1:19) in the fulfillment of these articles denouncing SDAs as "not evangelical."

BRIAN PILMOOR
Press and Public Relations Bureau
Nottingham, England

I believe he honestly tries to evaluate it as an unbiased observer . . . I charge . . . Lindsell of deliberate misrepresentation.

ELWOOD BOYD
Norfolk District of SDA
Norfolk, Neb.

Lindsell finds fault with . . . Nichol for defending Mrs. White . . . And if he had not defended her . . . would not . . . Lindsell have said that since the accusations against her had not been answered, . . . they were therefore true? There would appear to be no way of satisfying such a prejudiced mind.

RALPH LARSON
Hawaiian Mission of SDA
Kailua-Kona, Hawaii

The article . . . was about as bold a display of antinomianism as I have ever seen.

SAMUEL W. STOVALL
White Plains, N. Y.

I do not hold . . . SDAs are . . . consistent or they would practice circumcision.

Pataskala, O. FRANK B. HEADLEY

Is he trying to hoodwink the ignorant and unthinking?

Lincoln, Neb. FRANCES TAYLOR

Actually, the SDA authors he quotes couldn't have done a better job in preaching the truths of SDA than Mr. Lindsell. As a SDA I wish to say, "Thank you, Mr. Lindsell. Please keep it up. Maybe the denomination will take you on as a full-time worker."

Sikeston, Mo. W. O. BERRY

. . . Unsightly contribution . . . Marietta, Ga. E. A. CRANE

I feel this is a very well-written and conclusive article on this prominent subject. I wish that it could be put into an attractive tract form to be used with SDAs and to inform Christians.

Glen, N. H. WILFRED C. MELOON

I came across a very interesting . . . and fair analysis of SDA. The title . . . is "The Bible and SDA." Under this heading the following . . . are considered: the cleansing of the sanctuary, observance of the Jewish Sabbath, eschatological errors, the inspiration of Mrs. Ellen G. White,

salvation through the devil, and deceptive propaganda. This booklet can be obtained from the Faith, Prayer and Tract League, 1016 11th, NW, Grand Rapids, Mich. SAMUEL TEN BRINK
Bluffton Christian Reformed Church
Muskegon, Mich.

COOPERATIVE EVANGELISM

Some months ago Christianity published an article in opposition to "separation." Now it publishes another that avoids meeting the criticism that was made of the first one. In defense of having unbelievers sponsor evangelistic endeavors, Mr. Ferm (Apr. 14 issue) quotes Finney as saying, "My duty is to belong to the church, even if the devil should belong to it." Does this mean that it would be a sin to leave a church if the devil controls it? At any rate, Mr. Ferm's argument, during the course of which he asserts, "If it is compromise, then Finney compromised," requires for its validity the unexpressed premise that Finney could not have compromised. Personally I do not hold such an exalted opinion of Finney. Nor do I think that Jesus' preaching in the temple is comparable with being sponsored by unbelievers. Jesus did not have the sponsorship of the Pharisees.

The writer also appeals to Wesley, and rebukes some misinformed person who cited Wesley as a separationist. But now may we ask, is Mr. Ferm a member of the Anglican or Episcopal church? If separation is a sin, then all the Methodists are great sinners, and should return to their parent body. And all the rest of us, with them, should return to the Roman Catholic church. It is instructive to see that articles against separation, that is, against the purity of the Church, are ordinarily quiet as to the Protestant Reformation. Their arguments proceed on the tacit assumption that there are no apostate churches from which obedience to God requires separation. But such synagogues of Satan do indeed exist.

GORDON H. CLARK
Indianapolis, Ind.

The article . . . is but further evidence of the bankruptcy of thought and unbiblical approach used by those enamored of the current ecumenical evangelism, in a futile effort to vindicate it. To toss casually and indifferently aside "the few proof texts, such as II Cor. 6:14" advanced against the ecumenical program, and the substitution of example on the part of past evangelists, indicates the truthfulness of the fundamentalist charge that such programs are of men and not of God, since God makes known his will

only through his Word. The "proof-texts" are not few . . . , but even if they were but few would still be proof-texts.

KENNETH R. KINNEY
First Baptist Church
Johnson City, N. Y.

While it is not always wise to be continuously making war with apostates, it is deadly ever to make peace with them . . . The chasm between redemptive Christianity and non-redemptive religion . . . is not bridgeable.

New York City WILLIAM WARD AYER

Much on historical precedent; almost nothing for a scriptural basis. Thus, an extremely lopsided article.

H. CROSBY ENGLISHAN
Oldham Baptist Church
Oldham, S. Dak.

ON LOGICAL POSITIVISM

The March 17 issue carried a "Review of Current Thought" by Philip Edgcumbe Hughes of London which was a strange mixture of Scripture paraphrase, dogmatic arrogance, book reviews and confused thinking about contemporary British philosophy. . . .

From this article one would receive the impression that logical positivism was the current trend of philosophy in Britain and that *Language, Truth and Logic* by A. J. Ayer was its Bible. This is certainly a gross error. Mr. Hughes in the first paragraph identifies "contemporary linguistic philosophy" with logical positivism. This is a mistake all too common today. . . .

The book review of E. L. Mascall's *Words and Images* is very interesting and rewarding reading . . . Mr. Hughes has rightly pointed out the Achilles heel of the book from the perspective of an evangelical Christian apologetic. However, I want to defend Dr. Mascall for not appealing to the doctrine of creation: he is not writing theology. Dr. Mascall feels that philosophical questions deserve philosophic answers. On the other hand, if Mr. Hughes had wished to criticize the book he should have concentrated on philosophic issues, for instance, the several Thomist assumptions in the book

Mr. Hughes . . . asserts that logical positivism would have to sacrifice logic to the verification principle. As a matter of history this did not happen; as a matter of logic it was not at all necessary. . . .

I won't say much about the arrogant and dogmatic condemnations of the logical positivists. . . . Philosophic doctrines are not sinful; they are wrong. Mr.

Hughes may be quite correct in his analysis of man as sinner. My only contention is that honest philosophic questions and arguments deserve honest sympathy and honest answers. Since it seems that Mr. Hughes cannot refute the positivists, he has used ad hominem arguments. . . .
Indiana University ROBERT L. PERKINS
Bloomington, Ind.

It is good of Mr. Perkins to take notice of my brief Review of Current Religious Thought; but how he managed to receive the impression from what I wrote that logical positivism is "the current trend of philosophy in Britain" and Professor Ayer's *Language, Truth and Logic* "its Bible" is a mystery that I have not succeeded in solving. Such a view would indeed be, as Mr. Perkins affirms, "a gross error." The error, however, resides in his impression rather than in my article, for I neither wrote nor implied any such thing. Mr. Perkins also completely fails to meet my point about the incompatibility of the concept of logic with the verification principle of the logical positivists. As for Dr. Mascall's Thomistic predilections, I am of course well aware of these, but lack of space precluded an examination of this aspect of his thought.

To suggest, as Mr. Perkins does, that Mascall eschews theology in his book shows the former's reading of the book to be suspect, for Dr. Mascall does no such thing; nor is it correct to state that he makes no appeal to the doctrine of creation—on the contrary, he speaks of "that unique but universal characteristic of finite beings which manifests their dependence upon the creative activity of a transcendent cause, the God of Christian theology." My complaint was that Dr. Mascall has failed to indicate in a consistent manner the crucial relevance of this doctrine in any debate on epistemology from the Christian side. I believe that Mr. Perkins is fundamentally wrong in supposing that "philosophical questions deserve philosophical answers," when the person giving the answers is a *Christian*. Can he really believe that the fact of man's creaturehood and fallenness has no bearing on philosophy and must be dismissed as irrelevant theology? In making a distinction between what is sinful and what is wrong I presume Mr. Perkins will be prepared to grant that wrongness is not unconnected with the root of sinfulness. I am consoled that he should have found my review of Dr. Mascall's book "very interesting and rewarding reading," for that means the major portion of my article.

London PHILIP EDGCUMBE HUGHES

A LAYMAN and his Faith

EXPERIENCE VERSUS REVELATION

A CLUMSY DENIAL of truth can be infinitely less dangerous than an ingenious one.

A flat rejection of scriptural affirmations is nowhere near as serious as an approach by which an assumption is implanted later to develop into a false conclusion in the heart of the one affected.

Such assumptions are being widely made today and they can lead to serious conclusions. Implant the thought that one's Christian faith rests *primarily* in personal experience and it is not long before the basic importance of divine revelation is lost in the heady philosophy that one is the captain of his own soul's salvation.

¶ It sounds reasonable to say: "I believe this, not because the Bible says so, but because I have experienced it for myself." But it is exceedingly dangerous because it gives first place to experience and a secondary place to revelation. It is neither human reason nor human experience that authenticates the Scriptures. God's written Word is authentic even when reason rejects it. It is authentic even if human experience would seem to affirm otherwise. To take any other position means that the mind and experience of man has primacy over divine revelation.

To put it bluntly: God's Word is true, regardless of whether man accepts or rejects it. The Scriptures are authentic whether human experience confirms, or otherwise.

This is not to say that reason and experience are not vital; but it is to say that truth is dependent on neither.

A tree may fall in the forest where there are no ears to hear the fall. But the sound was produced just the same. So, too, the Scriptures depend for their truthfulness and their authority, not on the will or desire of man, but on the nature of their being an inspired revelation of truths man could never have learned in any other way.

¶ The importance of human reason can hardly be overestimated. But if logical, reason must also recognize something outside and above itself. Without the illumination and control of the Spirit of God, man's reason leads him into all degrees of folly. But when the Holy Spirit speaks in the Scriptures and to the

heart of the individual, divine revelation becomes *reasonable*. Without the Spirit, spiritual truths are foolishness.

This is not to say that Christian experience is not a pearl of great price. Nevertheless, Christian faith centers in the person and work of Christ. In the Scriptures we learn *who* he is and *what* he did. It is as we appropriate him—the Christ revealed in the Bible—that he also becomes the Christ of our own experience, and this appropriation is by an act of faith.

This is not quibbling over non-essentials. Rather, it is a discussion of something basic. It is popular in some circles to say that only as portions of the Scriptures are illuminated to us personally by the Holy Spirit do they become the Word of God. But whether we permit them so to speak to our hearts or not, they are still the written Word of God and testify of the incarnate Word, the living Christ. A sword, lying on a table, is a sword whether one takes it in his hand and uses it as a sword, or not. It is not making use of it that transforms it into a sword, but using it does make it a *usable* weapon. The Bible is the sword of the Spirit, whether we so use it, or not. We may negate its *usefulness* by denying or refusing to use it, but we have in no way affected its reliability or its authority. If we lightly regard it, we are the losers, not the Bible.

¶ One's attitude and method of approach are of vital importance. The *degree* or extent of one's faith is not the issue. Faith may be embryonic, or pitifully small, but *faith there must be*. "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth" reflects an *attitude* of mind and heart which God honors. "Lord I believe, help thou mine unbelief" is always a way to the heart of a loving Father. "If thou be the Son of God . . ." was invariably answered: "It is written."

Some years ago the writer was working on a fellowship for advanced study in surgery. During the early months we worked on cadavers in the dissecting hall. Later, we transferred to the operating room, operating on the living. One's attitude in the dissecting hall is totally different from that in the operating room. In the former there is an element of indifference and carelessness, for the subject is a *dead* body. But in the operating

room every aseptic precaution and every detail of technique and procedure is meticulously carried out because one is dealing with a *living* body.

There is some similarity of procedure when it comes to the Bible. If it is a human book, then it can and should be approached with that cold analysis and criticism we would accord any other work of man. But if it is divine revelation, one's approach must be totally different. This does not preclude any and every device of textual study and criticism available. The background and context must be carefully determined. The meaning of words must be determined in the light of the very best scholarship. As far as possible that which is historic and that which is prophetic must be defined. The allegorical and figurative must be recognized, and the poetic and symbolic should be determined.

¶ But in all critical and analytical study there should be reverent scholarship that recognizes divine revelation as standing in judgment over man, not man in judgment on divine revelation.

¶ By the assumption of some philosophical presupposition one can be led completely astray. Acting on the presupposition that the supernatural and the miraculous can be explained in naturalistic terms, one will inevitably miss the main thrust of divine revelation.

Two years ago the pastor of one of the largest churches in America preached a sermon in which he affirmed his belief in the historicity of the person and book of Jonah. As a result he found himself the object of some ridicule from some of his fellow ministers. Some days later he wrote a column for the religion section of one of his city's daily newspapers. In this column he affirmed his faith in a number of the supernatural events recorded in the Bible and closed with these words: "If I have erred it has been on the side of faith, not of unbelief."

How important it is today that we, too, err (if such is possible) on the side of faith. Human experience is a variable quantity, and it has led many good people astray. But to place our faith in the divine revelation—the Christ of the Scriptures—is to take one's stand on a rock that endures.

On the other hand, when we interpose either reason or human experience between our hearts and divine revelation, we demand an earthly explanation for a heavenly truth. We then by our own wilfulness close the door to the wisdom God only can impart. — L. NELSON BELL

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH UNITY

Almost a century ago—in April, 1866, to be exact—the noted Presbyterian theologian, Charles Hodge, preached a now long-forgotten sermon on “The Unity of the Church.” While voicing an impassioned plea for Protestant unity, the Princeton professor nevertheless escaped two perils that harass the contemporary ecclesiastical scene, namely, uncritical ecumenism and fragmenting independency. That this pertinent sermon remained unpublished (its outline appears in Hodge’s *Conference Papers* edited by his son) is one of the ironies of the times. (It should be noted, however, that the *Princeton Review* in 1865 carried Hodge’s article on “Principles of Church Union, and Reunion of Old and New School Presbyterians,” and that the article, incorporating much the same emphasis as the sermon, is abridged in Hodge’s book on *The Church and its Polity* which appeared in 1879.) The sermon manuscript was rediscovered recently in Princeton Theological Seminary library by Dr. David H. Baker, and *Eternity* magazine, which prints an abridgment in its June issue, has made the copy available for simultaneous use in CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Much as Dr. Hodge’s sermon proved timely in his own day, it holds even greater relevance in ours. Its sturdy content of 6500 well-chosen words is a tribute to the congregation of William Kellogg’s church in New York City, its original place of delivery. Since Hodge gave the same message (according to his annotation) in the chapel at Princeton, on whose faculty he served for a half century, this sermon also yields an insight into the high level of seminary addresses in that day. Its primary value, however, lies in its exhibition of “the principles of Christian unity as held by the great body of evangelical Christians.”

These principles Hodge propounds with a passion both for the purity and for the unity of the Church. “Instead of conflict, we should have concord. Instead of mutual criminations, we should have mutual respect and fellowship.” If followed, the tenets he ventures to suggest would presumably transform the strained relations among churches. “Instead of rivalry and opposition, there would be harmonious cooperation . . . and the sacramental host, although marshaled under different banners, and organized into different corps, would still, in the sight of God and man, be one great body, glorious, and through grace, invincible.”

Professor Hodge sounds a clarion call to love; as the high and holy test of Christian discipleship, it tran-

scends distinctions and barriers of race, color, nationality, social status and denomination. Since a vital relationship to Christ and the family of the redeemed (and not mere doctrinal conformity) is the foundation of Christian experience, Hodge emphasizes “love . . . founded on congeniality . . . not on sameness of views, feelings, affections, and objects of interest and pursuit, but founded rather on relationship.” “The want of brotherhood, the isolation of Christians, so that every one seems to be seeking his own, and not the welfare of others,” he declares, “is perhaps the most glaring defect of modern Christianity. It was not so at the beginning, and it will not be so at the end.” That this verdict was uttered not long after the Civil War permits scant comfort to our own generation to which the rebuke still applies. “One of the first evidences” that strength is returning to the Church for her conquest of the world, Hodge would still say to us, “will be the diffusion of this consciousness of brotherhood among all her members.” He even affirms that absence of brotherly love is “evidence that we are not disciples, that we have never been taught of God.”

In view of this distinct emphasis on Christian love, we are not surprised that Professor Hodge’s exposition of unity stresses the primacy of spiritual union. Those condemned for their sins and who remain in an unregenerate state are excluded from the body of Christ. Saving faith and especially the indwelling Spirit are the constituents of Christian unity. Since the indwelling Spirit is “the real bond of union between Christ and his people, and of their union one with another as members of his body,” Dr. Hodge declares it obvious “that this must determine the nature of the unity of the Church.” The Holy Spirit is “a formative, organizing principle.”

As Professor Hodge sees it, unity of the Church is not simply a matter of isolated interrelationships between redeemed individuals. “A solitary Christian is but half a Christian. There are elements of the spiritual life which can only be brought into action in organic union with his fellow Christians.” Christians must be “statedly united, not only for worship and praise, but also for prayer,” and to discriminate between those who are eligible and ineligible for admission to the fellowship of faith. Christians are to associate in visible churches. In this collective relationship the New Tes-

tament imposes upon them explicit duties including public worship, the observance of baptism and of the Lord's Supper.

But there is more. Unity of the Church does not stop with "the inward spiritual unity of believers in faith and love," Dr. Hodge insists, nor with "a like spiritual unity of individual, separate churches or congregations." Specifically, "There is no reason why individual churches should remain isolated, without organic, visible union with other churches."

It would be easy to interpret these words as a prophetic approval of twentieth century ecumenism. But close study of Dr. Hodge's sermon yields no justification for this. Actually, what he approves and promotes is denominationalism. He maintains that "the law of the Spirit tends to the organic union of separate churches in the same way and to the same extent that it tends to the external union of believers in individual churches," that in all ages an inward law of the Spirit motivates the Church to outward unity. "The inward unity of believers expresses itself in the outward union of church organizations" and these separate churches (Hodge calls them "organic, external societies") thus remain one. Isolated churches that have no organic union with other churches are considered abnormal.

In keeping with Presbyterianism, Dr. Hodge affirms the obligation of individual member churches to defer to the Spirit's rule in the larger collectivities. He notes that in apostolic times all churches were subject to the over-all authority of the specially-gifted apostles, whose power extended to church government as well as to teaching. The churches continue "one body because they are subject to one common tribunal. That common tribunal at first was the Apostles, now the Bible and the mind of the Church as a whole. . . ."

This combination of spiritual and external unity marked by "the subjection of each part to the whole" has never been attained, says Hodge. It nonetheless remains the Church's proper norm. For this goal "she should strive, and . . . failure to attain . . . should be recognized as an imperfection and a sin."

Professor Hodge's proposals for diminishing "the evils of their external divisions" and for increasing the "spiritual fellowship" of the churches are significant for today's ecclesiastical debate. Concerned that "the Protestant world . . . present an undivided front against infidelity and every anti-Christian error," he offers five principles to advance Church unity: mutual recognition; intercommunion; recognition of the validity of sacraments and orders administered by the respective churches; non-interference; and cooperation in common

causes. In view of ingenious modern solutions such as emphasis on mission more than on doctrine; on creedal broadness rather than on precision; and on mammoth superdenominational structures, what Hodge does not include in his suggested remedies is equally noteworthy.

Professor Hodge does not unqualifiedly underwrite ecumenism at any price. "We must remember . . . that real union is within and by the Spirit. We must begin there. And as it is there perfected it will more and more manifest itself outwardly in unity of faith, of love, of worship, and obedience. . . ." "External union is the product and expression of internal unity. The former cannot be safe or desirable when pressed beyond the latter."

Moreover, Hodge particularly questions a least-common-denominator unity that blurs legitimate doctrinal considerations. Causes "legitimate and worthy of respect," he notes, may prevent "normal unity." Among these causes he specifically mentions "conscientious differences of opinion on questions of doctrine and order as render harmonious action in one and the same externally united body impossible." Hodge even asserts that "as believers are imperfect in knowledge and in grace, such diversities of opinion in doctrine and order unavoidably arise which render this external union of all local churches impractical and undesirable." Moreover, the Princeton theologian counsels: "It is better to separate than to quarrel or to oppress. Two cannot walk together unless they be agreed." "Where two bodies of Christians differ so much either as to doctrine or order as to render their harmonious action in the same ecclesiastical body impossible, it is better that they should form distinct organizations." Until "such unity of opinion" is attained "as to render external union practicable and desirable . . . all attempts at external union are premature and injurious." Indeed, "the constantly recurring efforts to keep men united externally who were inwardly at variance" Hodge calls "one of the greatest evils in the history of the Church." Such forced union, he declares, "leads to persecution, to hypocrisy, and to the suppression of the truth."

It is clear that Professor Hodge supports the legitimacy of denominations over superdenominational agencies which sacrifice the lively sense of truth to the objective of unity. He specifically illustrates the divisions he has in view by reference to "Episcopalians . . . Presbyterians . . . Independents" and not alone to "Romanists and Protestants." "The existence of denominational churches in the present state of Christendom," he writes, "is unavoidable."

Since believers lack omniscience, their ignorance and diversity account for doctrinal differences no less than differences in the measure of love and zeal among each

other. Consequently, perfect unity continues to be a goal rather than an actuality. This lack in no way discredits Christian identification with "a common faith," however, nor does it impugn the Church's confidence in divinely revealed doctrines. In fact, Hodge introduces his sermon with the reminder that Church unity is among the most clearly revealed doctrines in Scripture. Similarly, his emphasis on Christian love is rooted in the authoritative biblical revelation to which he appeals again and again. Scriptural doctrines generate the first six ecumenical creeds. Through these creeds—despite denominational diversity and disagreement on nonessentials—the Church (as a regenerate body sharing the same inward religious life) retains one central creedal standard.

The scope Dr. Hodge assigns to truth as well as to love as the substance of Christian unity is therefore quite apparent. What he says to our day is worth hearing. Fragmentation is costly. So is mere external union. True unity, spiritual unity, is still a Christian imperative. It still obligates the body of Christ to fidelity both in love and in truth.

JAPAN'S CALL FOR EVANGELISTIC MISSIONARIES

Protestantism lost a golden opportunity in Japan when she failed to take advantage of the unprecedented opening for Christian missions following World War II. The chance for wholesale impact has now been lost but that nation is still wide open as a field for evangelistic endeavor, and while the missionary (fortunately) is no longer on a pedestal he is needed and he is welcome.

Technical aid and educational experts in missions are indeed necessary, but the great need is still for men and women to preach and live the Gospel in the midst of a people who have a great culture and the highest literacy rate in the world, so few of whom know Christ.

The Synod of Kyushu, which measures in number of churches and believers about one-tenth of the United Church in Japan (Kyodan), has made a careful evaluation of the work of that area, the unreached cities and villages and the need for additional evangelistic missionaries to aid in reaching the people of Japan with the Gospel.

A copy of this significant report has been forwarded to this paper by the Rev. Osamu Murakami, pastor of the Yahata Kyodan Church and a member of the standing committee which prepared the report.

Mr. Murakami solicits the prayers and help of those interested and writes: "We welcome missionaries."

This report is of more than passing significance because it points up the present trend of the eight cooperating boards operating as the Inter-Board Com-

mittee to send missionaries into institutional rather than evangelistic and pastoral work.

The fact that the Japanese church is asking for more ordained missionaries to come to share in pastoral and evangelistic work is also significant. This report states that less than half as many ordained evangelistic missionaries have been sent to Kyushu as before the war and that now the number of missionaries engaged in church extension is extremely small, while eighteen cities are mentioned in which there are no churches of any denomination.

One solution suggested is the waiving of retirement age for elderly missionaries in that area.

Japan desperately needs the Gospel and the Japanese Christians and the Japanese church continue to welcome missionaries. That they are pleading for pastors and evangelists should be a source of thankfulness and a challenge to those who are willing to heed the Great Commission.

Here is a challenge to men and women who have dedicated their lives to our Lord. It is a challenge because of the need and also because of the difficulties. An old and proud culture, a complicated language and many difficult adjustments are some of the obstacles in the way of an effective witness. But the rewards will be both immediate and eternal.

END

CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY

(*Cont'd from p. 14*) religion, therefore, deal with secondary and tertiary matters, never directly with the divine Spirit.

Second, that anything which attempts to ground the Christian faith solely in religious experience, or any movement within Christendom which exalts personal religious experience over against the God who creates true spiritual experiences must be resisted.

How much ado is there in Scripture over this or that man's conversion? Very little, with the exception of Paul's conversion of which some was made, due to the peculiarly theological cruciality of its nature. But the New Testament gives little regard to the conversion experience of this famous or that notorious character because, from the perspective of biblical faith, the real wonder is that God comes to us, and through Jesus Christ creates a living fellowship in our hearts. And as this is true, it is just as much miracle in the heart of a child as in the heart of a murderer; it is just as much miracle in the heart of a common daily laborer as it is in the heart of some world-renowned personality.

A theology that knows its Scripture never overemphasizes psychological experience at the expense of the miracle-action of God. Rather, it is careful to rest its apologetic not in the flux and flow of religious experience, but in the self-revelation of the eternal God.

END

The Unity of the Church

CHARLES HODGE

By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body (1 Cor. 12:13).

The unity of the Church is one of the most clearly revealed doctrines of the Bible. There is one fold, and one shepherd; one king, and one kingdom; one temple, an habitation of God through the Spirit; one vine, of which all believers are the branches; one body, of which all are members. The very expression "the Church," so familiar to the ears of the readers of the Scriptures, implies that there can be but one Church which Christ loved and for which he died.

I. *This one Church includes the saints in heaven as well as those on earth.* Both classes belong to that kingdom of which Christ is the Lord, and to that body of which he is the head. There is but one Father of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.

Such has been the common faith of Christians. They are taught to say: "We believe in the Holy Catholic Church." On this point there has never been any diversity of opinion.

II. A second point no less clear is that *believers are one in virtue of their union with Christ.* They are one body in Christ Jesus. He is the vine. They are the branches. Union with the same vine makes the branches one. He is the head. We are the members. Only those in vital union with the head are members of the body of Christ, which is his Church.

III. The next question is, what constitutes union with Christ? Who are in him, in the Scriptural sense of those words? This is a question which cannot be answered in a simple sentence, because *that union is manifold, and includes three distinct, although intimately related elements.*

1. *We are said to be in him before the foundation of the world.* There is a union in idea, in thought, of purpose, which antedates all that is real and actual. As we were in Adam before we were born, so we were in Christ before the worlds were made. This covenant union secured actual, living, saving union in time, according to the terms of the compact between the Father and the Son, on which it is founded.

2. *Those thus in Christ come into the world in a state of sin and condemnation, and so remain until united to him, by renewing of the Holy Ghost, and the indwelling of the Spirit.*

3. *The first conscious exercise of the new life thus imparted is faith in Christ.* As soon as the newborn child of God opens its eyes, it sees the glory of God in Jesus Christ, and receives him as its God and Saviour. The soul is now in him by faith. Faith is the living, abiding, conscious bond of union between the soul and Christ. . . .

In Ephesians 3:17 it is said, Christ dwells in our hearts by faith. In 1 John 4:15 it is said: "Whosoever confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." As there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ, so those who believe are not condemned. In Galatians

3:26 those who are in Christ are said to be sons of God. . . .

IV. *The unity by faith is however due to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; so that it is by one Spirit we are baptized into one body.* As the vine is one because it has one life; and as the body is one, because animated by one soul, so the Church is one because there is one Spirit, the Holy Ghost, which is the Spirit of Christ, which is given to him without measure, dwelling in all his members. They have a common life. It is not they that live, but Christ that liveth in them. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9). "Know ye not," says the Apostle, "that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. 3:16).

To this indwelling of the Spirit, the existence, continuance, and fruits of spiritual life are referred. And this being the real bond of union between Christ and his people, and of their union one with another as members of his body, it is obvious that this must determine the nature of the unity of the Church, and all its legitimate or normal manifestations and fruits.

1. *First, then, the Church is one in faith.* This follows because the Spirit is a teacher, and his teaching is common to all the people of God. The Spirit was promised to the disciples, and not exclusively to the apostles. Our Lord says of his followers: "They shall all be taught of God (John 6:45). The Apostle says of believers: "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you, but the same anointing teacheth you all things, and is the truth" (1 John 2: 20, 27). The natural man, says St. Paul, receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned; but the spiritual man discerneth or knoweth all things. It was promised of old that when Christ came the Spirit should be poured upon all men, upon young and old, upon men servants and maid servants, and the effects of this affusion should be not only temporary miraculous gifts, but spiritual illumination and divine teaching. For it is written of all the people of God: "I will put My laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts . . . and all shall know Me from the least unto the greatest" (Heb. 8:10-11).

As this teaching of the Spirit is common to all, it must produce the same effect in all, and that effect must be a common faith. Hence the Apostle tells us that the Church has one faith, as well as one Lord and one baptism. All are baptized in the name of the same God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; all acknowledge Jesus Christ to be their Lord; all believe the record which the Father has given of the Son.

As the promises of God, however, do not secure perfection to the individual child of God in this life, neither perfection in holiness or in blessedness, so neither do they secure perfection in knowledge. And so long as knowledge is imperfect, it will be attended more or less with ignorance and divinity.

In consistence, therefore, with this unity of faith in all that is necessary to the existence and fruits of the divine life, and to the salvation of the soul, there may be, and must be, in this world, differences of doctrine among the true members of the Church. Perfect unity is the goal toward which we tend. God has given us the means of instruction "until we are come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God; unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13). So long as we know in part, so long as we see through a glass darkly, we must, within certain limits, see differently. But this is no more inconsistent with the real and living unity of faith than the different measures of our love and zeal are inconsistent with our having a common God and Saviour.

What is declared in the Scriptures to be true is found to be true in fact. All Christians adopt the Apostles' Creed. All historical churches subscribe to the doctrinal decisions of the first six Ecumenical Councils. Every doctrine essential to salvation is found in the creeds of the Greek, Latin, Lutheran, Reformed churches, and of every recognized Christian denomination on the face of the earth. In spite, therefore, of diversity of opinion on non-essential points, in spite, too, of mutual denunciations, and criminations, and sentences of excommunication, the Church emerges from the discord and tumult of conflict as one body, having one leader, and marshaled under one standard.

2. *The Church is one in its inward religious life.* The indwelling of the Holy Spirit produces the same effects in the hearts of all believers.

Conviction, regeneration, sanctification are essentially the same process in all the children of God. All are brought especially to acknowledge their just exposure to condemnation for the sin of not believing upon Christ. All are convinced of his righteousness, of the righteousness of his claim to be the Son of God, God manifest in the flesh, who has wrought our everlasting righteousness for us sinners, and that he is therefore the only Saviour of the world. All therefore love, worship, and obey him as their God, and trust him as their Saviour. All are convinced of judgment, of the final condemnation of Satan and overthrow of the kingdom of darkness.

As human nature is everywhere the same, so that as in water face answers to face, heart answers to heart, so also one regenerate soul, the world over, answers to another. They all have the lineaments of their common Father. They are all more or less conformed to the image of Christ. They are one, therefore, by an intimate, enduring community of spiritual life, derived from Christ, head of the whole mystical body.

3. *The Church is one in virtue of the mutual love of all its members.* The Spirit dwells in all believers as the Spirit of love. This is the test of discipleship. "Hereby shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love for one another" (John 13:35). "If a man . . . loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" (1 John 4:20). This love is founded on congeniality; not sameness of views, feelings, affections, and of objects of interest and pursuit, but founded rather upon relationship. They are brethren, children of the same Father, members of the same family, having a common object of adoration and love.

It is vain to ask why relationship produces love. This is a

law of our being, and the degree of love is in proportion to the intimacy of the relation. Members of the same nation have a feeling for each other which they have not for foreigners. Members of the same tribe or class in a community are bound together by a still closer tie. Parents and children, brothers and sisters constitute a unit in a yet higher scale; until we come to the vital union of the members of the same body, when the love becomes perfect. There can be no discord or alienation between the hands and feet, between the eye and the ear. If one member suffers all the members suffer with it. And if one is honored all rejoice with it.

It is this union between the members of the human body which the Apostle selects to illustrate the union of believers. They are one, as the body is one. They have a common life, the necessary result of which is mutual sympathy and affection. One true Christian can no more hate another, without doing violence to his nature, than the foot can hate the hand, or the hand the foot.

If brotherly love is the evidence of discipleship, the want of it, is evidence that we are not disciples, that we have never been taught of God. "Behold how these Christians love one another!" has been the exclamation of the world, in all ages, at every genuine exhibition of the Christian character.

Love is active. It is an operative principle. Wherever it exists, it will manifest itself in its appropriate fruits.

The mutual love of Christians, therefore, reveals itself, first, in mutual recognition. Christians know and acknowledge each other as brethren. One may be rich, the other poor; one bond, the other free; one a Greek, another a barbarian; one a Jew, another a Gentile; it makes no difference. All are one in Christ Jesus. They instinctively love, honor, and confide in each other as the common children of God. They recognize the dignity and the equality which belongs to this high relationship. Every believer has experienced this, and constantly experiences it in his own life. He knows that when he meets a true Christian in any part of the world, it matters not to what nation, or to what denomination he may belong, his heart goes out to him, and he cannot help giving him the right hand of fellowship. He will acknowledge that he possesses all the prerogatives and privileges of a child of God; that he is to be recognized as such and admitted to our Christian fellowship and communion. He will pray with him, worship with him, and sit down with him at the common table of the Lord. If this is not done, violence is done to the instincts of his Christian nature, and he withholds more or fewer of these recognitions of brotherhood out of regard to some external authority, or from obedience to some restrictive principle felt to be in conflict with the spirit of the Gospel.

Love which spends itself in words, which merely says: "Be thou warmed and clothed," is no love. The union which is produced by the Spirit of God among believers leads to a real brotherhood, a real community of interest, a real disposition to communicate of what we have, so that, as the Apostle says, there may be equality.

The want of brotherhood, the isolation of Christians, so that every one seems to be seeking his own, and not the welfare of others, is perhaps the most glaring defect of modern Christianity. It was not so at the beginning, and it will not be so at the end.

One of the first indications of the revival of the Church, one of the first evidences that strength is coming to her again for the conquest of the world will be the diffusion of this consciousness of brotherhood among all her members, so that no one will be disposed to say that aught of the things that he possesses is his own.

Christianity, however, is not agrarian. It joins no community of goods. It does no violence to the laws of our nature. Even in the best regulated Christian families there is often great disparity in the wealth and social position of its members. Nevertheless, they are brothers. They love each other as such, and are ever disposed to aid, comfort, and defend those with whom they are thus united. Thus it should be, and will be, in the brotherhood of Christians. If one suffers, all will suffer. If one is honored, all will rejoice. "Who is weak," says Paul, "and I am not weak? Who is offended and I burn not?" (2 Cor. 12:29). "Inasmuch," says our Lord, "as ye did it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me" (Matt. 25:40).

What has yet been said of the unity of believers in faith, in Christian experience, in fellowship and love, concerns only their relation to each other as individuals. This, however, is not all that is meant by the unity of the Church.

The Holy Spirit, as he dwells in the hearts of the people of God, is a formative, organizing, principle. Such is the nature of man as constituted by God that he is a social being. Men by an inward law form themselves into families, tribes, and nations. This union of individuals into organized communities is necessary for security, for the well-being of the whole, and for the proper development of the individual. A hermit ceases almost to be a man. Half his nature lies dormant. All this is true of the Christian life. A solitary Christian is but half a Christian. There are elements of the spiritual life which can only be brought into action in organic union with his fellow Christians.

Believers have feelings to be exercised, exigencies to be met, and duties to be performed, which assume and demand organic union with his fellow believers. Having a common God and Father, a common Saviour, a common redemption, it is impossible that they should not write in acts of worship. They are impelled by a law of their new nature to call on all who are of a like mind, all who are partakers of the same redemption, to unite with them in worshipping and praising their common Redeemer. They have also the same necessities, the same dangers to fear, and the same blessings to seek. And therefore, just as a nation threatened with a common calamity, or groaning under a common judgment, unites in imploring the intervention of God in their behalf, so do Christians, whose common dangers are always imminent, and those common wants are always urgent, must be stately united, not only for worship and praise, but also for prayer.

Besides this, as believers are spiritually one, as they are bound together as professors of the same faith, and servants of a common master, they have not only a mutual interest in each other's welfare, but a mutual responsibility for each other's conduct. They are jointly intrusted with their Master's honor. They are therefore bound to decide who are, and who are not entitled to be recognized as Christians. They are essentially a communion, and must have the right of determining who are to be admitted to their fellowship, for whose faith and conduct they are jointly responsible.

The New Testament, therefore, not only assumes that believers will associate for worship and mutual watch and care, but it abounds with instructions and exhortations addressed to them in their associated capacity, that is, as churches. Most of the Epistles were written to such associations, and duties are enjoined upon them which can only be executed in their collective capacity.

They are to receive and reject members. They are to conduct public worship. They are to provide for the instruction of the people and the propagation of the Gospel. They are to

have their prescribed officers, and to be united in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

The fact that believers in all ages under the guidance of the Apostles, and from their day to this, have thus associated as churches, proves that such is the Law of the Spirit. If what all men do is to be referred to a law of their nature, what all Christians do must be referred to a law of their nature as Christians.

Since all believers, as such, stand in the same relation to each other, and as the impulse and obligation to associate is common to all, it is obvious that there is nothing except considerations of convenience to determine the limits of such association or churches. Those living sufficiently near each other would naturally unite and form themselves into a Christian Church. Hence in the New Testament we read of the Church at Jerusalem, of the Church in Antioch, Philippi, and Corinth, and of the Churches of Judea and Galatia. Thus numerous individual churches were formed. Now as the unity of the Church does not stop with the inward spiritual unity of believers in faith and love, so neither does it stop with a like spiritual unity of individual, separate churches or congregations. There is no reason why it should stop there, and as an historical fact, it never has been thus limited.

First, there is no reason why individual churches should remain isolated, without organic, visible union with other churches. They constitute one body. They stand to each other in a relation analogous to that in which individual believers sustain, the one to another. They are bound to mutual recognition, to fellowship and intercommunion. A member of one is a member of all, for all have the same faith, the same Lord, the same terms of fellowship. A Christian in one place is a Christian in another place. His prerogatives arise out of his character and his relation to Christ, and therefore go with him wherever he goes.

From this it follows that in the ideal or normal state of the Church, all separate churches would be one, so far as their membership is concerned. A member of the Church in Jerusalem, if he changed his residence, became of right a member of the Church of Antioch or Corinth, or wherever else he might fix his dwelling.

Again, these separate churches are as much bound to be subject to one another as are individual believers. We are commanded to obey our brethren in the Lord, simply because they are our brethren; because they are the temple and agent of the Holy Ghost; and because they have a joint interest and responsibility in the character and conduct of all who profess the name of Christ. This obligation does not arise out of mere proximity of residence, and therefore is not limited to those who reside in the same place. Neither does it arise out of any covenant, or mutual promise of obedience, and therefore is not confined to those who may form that social compact. As it arises out of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, it extends to all in whom the Spirit dwells, and is to be exercised, of course according to the rule of Christ, whatever that may be. But the point now is that the law of the Spirit tends to the organic union of separate churches in the same way and to the same extent that it tends to the external union of believers in individual churches.

In the second place, what is thus seen to be the law of the Spirit, or the tendency of the internal life of believers, is found to be the fact in the history of the Church. Wherever churches remain isolated, out of organic union with all other churches, that condition has been recognized as abnormal, as something to be accounted for, if not always justified, by

ab extra influences.

In the apostolic period all churches were united, not only, as was remarked, because a member of one was entitled to membership in all, but each recognized all others as churches having all the Scriptural prerogatives and privileges of such organizations. They recognized the validity of each other's ordinances. A man baptized or ordained in Jerusalem had not to be rebaptized or reordained when he went to Corinth. A man excommunicated by one Church was excluded from all.

But besides all this, they were all subject to a common authority. The Apostles were not diocesan bishops. Their jurisdiction extended over all Christians, and over all churches. This necessarily arose from their gifts and from their commission. Hence, Paul wrote to the Church at Rome with full apostolic authority before he had ever visited that city. Peter, in like manner, addressed as an Apostle and Elder the Churches of Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, in the center of the field of Paul's missionary labors. The power thus assumed was not that of teaching only, but also of government. We find also that the Council of Jerusalem issued decrees for all the churches of the Gentiles to observe.

What was true in the apostolic age has proved, as a general rule, true ever since. In nature every thing organic, every plant or animal, has a *nisus formativus*, by which it is impelled, as by an inward necessity, to assume the form suited to its nature. This inward impulse may be impeded or perverted by various circumstances . . . nevertheless, it never fails to manifest its existence, and the state to which it tends.

So it is with the Church. It has always striven after unity. This has been its characteristic in all ages. It gave rise to the ideas of heresy and schism. It manifested itself in the provincial and general councils. At the Reformation the same feeling revealed itself. The churches then formed ran together as naturally as drops of quicksilver. And when union was in any case prevented, it was by insuperable hindrances, which counteracted an obvious and admitted tendency, and was deplored as an evil.

This historical fact, this continual effort of believers in all ages to present themselves before God and man as one body is the revelation of an inward law which must be recognized as the law of the Spirit. It operates according to the command of Christ, and toward an end which he has taught us to regard as of the highest importance.

The theory of the Church, therefore, everywhere presented in the Scriptures, is that believers are a band of brethren, children of the same Father, fellow-citizens, subject to the same King, united together as one mystical body by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and therefore having the same faith, the same inward life or experience, recognizing each other as fellow Christians, and loving each other as the hands sympathize with the feet, and the feet with the hands. This is the spiritual, or mystical union of believers, as individuals, scattered over the face of the earth.

But, as we have seen, as man is a social being, and is led to unite with his fellow men in organic, external societies, so believers, under the guidance of the Spirit, unite in forming themselves into separate, individual churches, for the purposes of worship, and mutual watch and care. Thus the inward unity of believers expresses itself in the outward union of church organizations.

These separate churches, however, remain one. 1. Because they continue to be subject to the same Lord, to be animated by the same Spirit, and to possess the same faith. 2. Because they recognize each other as churches, just as every Christian recognizes every other Christian as a fellow believer, and

consequently recognize each other's members, ordinances, ministers and acts of discipline. 3. They continue one body because they are subject to one common tribunal. That common tribunal at first was the Apostles, now the Bible and the mind of the Church as a whole, expressed sometimes in one way and sometimes in another.

Such at least is the normal state of the Church. It is one body, not only in virtue of its spiritual unity, but externally, by the subjection of each part to the whole.

It is a melancholy fact that this normal state has never been fully reached. It is a goal apparently as distant now as it was centuries ago. Still it should be recognized as the goal to which the Church tends, for which she should strive, and the failure to attain which should be recognized as an imperfection and a sin.

The causes which have prevented this normal unity of the Church are patent to every reader of its history. Some of these causes are altogether unworthy and evil, others are legitimate and worthy of respect, and such as, while they exist, should be patiently submitted to.

The former class do not demand our attention.

The second consists in such conscientious differences of opinion on questions of doctrine and order as render harmonious action in one and the same externally united body impossible. It is better to separate than to quarrel or to oppress. Two cannot walk together unless they be agreed.

External union is the product and expression of internal unity. The former cannot be safe or desirable when pressed beyond the latter. One of the greatest evils in the history of the Church has been the constantly recurring efforts to keep men united externally who were inwardly at variance. Such forced union must be insincere and pernicious. It leads to persecution, to hypocrisy, and to the suppression of the truth. Where two bodies of Christians differ so much either as to doctrine or order as to render their harmonious action in the same ecclesiastical body impossible, it is better that they should form distinct organizations.

Such are the differences not only between Romanists and Protestants, but between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, between Presbyterians and Independents. We may lament over such differences, and the separations, alienations, jealousies, and conflicts which they are adapted to produce, but no wise man would propose to act as though the differences did not exist. They are facts which must be recognized and taken into account. We may labor to remove them, and to produce such unity of opinion as to render external union practicable and desirable, but until such unity is attained, all attempts at external union are premature and injurious.

Admitting, therefore, that the existence of denominational churches, in the present state of Christendom, is unavoidable, the practical question is: What course ought they to pursue to increase their spiritual fellowship, and to diminish the evils of their external divisions?

1. *The first of those duties is mutual recognition.* As we are bound to recognize every Christian as a Christian and treat him accordingly, so we are bound to recognize every Church as a Church, and treat it accordingly. And as we are not at liberty to give an arbitrary definition of a Christian so as to exclude any of the true children of God, so we are not at liberty to give an arbitrary definition of the Church, so as to exclude any of the true Churches of our common Lord.

A Christian is a man united to Christ by the Holy Spirit. A Church is a number of such men united together for the purposes of Christian worship and mutual watch and care. This is the Scriptural definition which we are not at liberty

to alter.

The Church consists of the Called. And an organized body of the Called, organized i.e. for church purposes, is a Church. Everywhere in the New Testament the word *ekklesia* is used as a collective term for the *kletoi*. As a man's being a Christian does not depend on anything external, upon stature, color, or nationality, so whether a body of Christians is a Church cannot depend upon the mode of their organization. There may be a wise or unwise, a good or bad, a Scriptural or unscriptural mode, but the form cannot be essential to the being of a Church unless it be essential to the Christianity of its members. *Ubi Spiritus Dei, ibi Ecclesia* has been a motto and an axiom with evangelical men in all ages.

There is indeed a theory which makes the form everything. Romanists teach that Christ gave the Holy Ghost to his apostles, and with it the power to communicate the Spirit by the imposition of hands. This gift and power they transmitted to their official successors, and they again to theirs in unbroken succession. It is in the line of this succession that the Spirit works. His saving influences are imparted to those only who receive the sacraments from men who have the supernatural power to render them efficacious. As no man, therefore, can be a Christian, who is not subject to those thus commissioned to impart the Holy Ghost, of course no organization can be a Church unless it be subject to the exclusive dispensers of salvation. This is a theory with which, at present, we have nothing to do. A man who confines Christianity to the members of any one external organization is not to be argued with.

Apart from this theory, we do not see how, on Scriptural principles, we can deny a church character in their collective capacity to those whom we are constrained to recognize as Christians.

2. A second duty which denominational Churches have to each other is *intercommunion*. The terms of Christian fellowship are prescribed by Christ, and are the same for all Churches. No particular or denominational Church has the right to prescribe any term of communion which is not common to all. And as we simply recognize as fellow Christians those with whom we commune, it is evidently a breach of Christian fellowship to refuse to join our fellow believers at the Lord's table, provided nothing is required of us beyond what Christ has enjoined.

3. A third duty is that of recognizing the validity of their sacraments and orders. If the validity of the sacraments depends on some virtue in him who administers them, then those only are valid which are administered by those having that virtue. But if their validity depends, first, on that being done which Christ has commanded; and secondly, on its being done by a Church, and by its authority, and by its appointed agents; and thirdly, with the serious intention of complying with the command of our Lord; then it follows that we must recognize the validity of the sacraments administered in any body which we recognize as a Church.

So also of ordination. If ordination be the communication of supernatural power (called the grace of order) by those to whom the ability to confer such power exclusively belongs, then those only can be regarded as true ministers who have been ordained by that specially gifted class of men. And if ordination be, in the strict sense of the term, the conferring of authority by those having the right of appointment, as a king or president, who grants commissions, then again those only can be recognized as clothed with the ministerial office, who have been appointed by those having the exclusive right to appoint and ordain.

But if the Protestant doctrine be true, that the call to the

ministry is by the Holy Ghost, and the office of the Church in the matter is simply to authenticate that call, and testify of it to the Churches, then we are bound to regard as a minister of Christ any man whom a Church has, by its appropriate agents, recognized as called by the Holy Ghost to the sacred office.

This of course does not imply that every denomination is bound to receive into the number of its own ministers any man whom any particular denomination may see fit to ordain. Every denominational Church has a right to determine its own standard of ministerial qualifications, according to its understanding of the law of Christ. But nevertheless we may consistently recognize him as a minister of Christ.

4. A fourth duty of denominational Churches is *non-interference*. The field is the world, and is wide enough for all. And therefore it is a breach of the principles of unity for one denomination to attempt to break down or to encroach upon the churches of another denomination.

5. Finally, there is the duty of cooperation in the promotion of the objects of our common Christianity.

Such is a meagre skeleton of the principles of Church unity as held by the great body of evangelical Christians.

All believers, scattered over the world, are one body in Christ Jesus, in virtue of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. This constitutes them one in faith, one in their inward religious life, one in love, and one in Christian sympathy and fellowship.

These individual Christians organize themselves into local churches for the purpose of worship and mutual watch and care. These local churches, in the normal state of things, would constitute one body, not only by the unity of their faith and fellowship, but also by their mutual subjection. But as believers are imperfect in knowledge and in grace, such diversities of opinion in doctrine and order unavoidably arise which render this external union of all local churches impractical and undesirable. Hence, denominational Churches become an absolute necessity. But these Churches are bound to recognize each other as Churches, to intercommune, to regard the sacraments and orders of each other as valid, to avoid interference with one another, and to cooperate in the promotion of the cause and kingdom of their common God and Saviour.

If these principles are correct, it is of the last importance that they should be acknowledged and practically followed out. Instead of conflict, we should have concord. Instead of mutual criminations, we should have mutual respect and fellowship. And instead of rivalry and opposition, there would be harmonious cooperation. The Protestant world might then present an undivided front against infidelity and every anti-christian error. And the sacramental host, although marshalled under different banners, and organized into different corps, would still, in the sight of God and man, be one great body, glorious, and through grace, invincible.

We must remember, however, that real union is within and by the Spirit. It must begin there. And as it is there perfected it will more and more manifest itself outwardly in unity of faith, of love, of worship, and obedience; until the whole multitude of believers shall, as at the beginning, be of one heart, and of one soul, and when they shall with one accord praise the Lord in all the languages of the earth. There is more included in union with Christ, and in the fellowship of believers, than has entered into the heart of man to conceive. Let us then see to it that we are in Christ, and be ever mindful that we are one body, and members one of another.

END

ISRAEL—FULFILLMENT OF PROPHECY?



The town of Nazareth, Israel, 1958 A.D., where Jesus Christ worked in a carpenter's shop. Here, too, was located the synagogue where he worshipped.

"Your name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel, for you have striven with God and with men, and have prevailed."

Thus in Genesis 32:28 the name Israel became associated with God's chosen people, called earlier (in Genesis 12:1) to "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee."

Jews have always held that the "land," with or without the name Israel, was in Palestine. In point of fact, there was no Israel as such between 721 B.C. and 1948 A.D. But for ten years now, the Jews have had a new autonomous Israel—in Palestine!

The end of the new Israel's first decade prompted observances and varied tributes all over the world in honor of the blossoming desert country with an area comparable to that of New Jersey.

Many American newspapers saluted the tenth anniversary of Israel with editorials commending the state's spirited progress. "Conceived in idealism and born in fire, Israel has already accomplished the impossible," said the *New York Times*. David Ben-Gurion was called a "messianic" prime minister.

Both houses of the United States Congress heard speeches marking the occasion. Some 50,000 persons crowded into New York's Polo Grounds for a "Salute to Freedom Rally" under auspices of the American Committee for Israel's Tenth Anniversary Celebration. Protestant and Catholic clergymen participated in the event with Jewish rabbis. A New York luncheon by the American Christian Committee drew another 250 religious leaders and civic officials. A public observance in Washington, witnessed by a crowd of 2500 in Constitution Hall, was addressed by Senator John F. Kennedy, Catholic Democrat from Massachusetts, and Senator Clifford P. Case, Presbyterian Republican from New Jersey. In Israel itself, parades were held as thousands of tourists poured in from all over the world.

Communications media, particularly in America, were carrying prodigious accounts of Israel's meteoric rise. Politically recognized first by the United States, the young state was now gaining recognition in new phases of achievement. Food-stuffs from Israel were coming to be a more common sight on supermarket shelves. One report said that more than two million wild gladiola bulbs will be imported from Israel to America during 1958. U. S. aid, which in turn has been the backbone of Jewish economy, was taking at least one strange twist: August A. Busch Jr.,

brewery magnate and owner of the St. Louis Cardinals, was to be honored at a New York dinner, June 4, "to hail his support of the introduction of baseball play in Israel." A central baseball park, to be named Busch Stadium, will be built on a plot of ground overlooking the Mediterranean just north of Tel-Aviv.

From a secular standpoint, tension with the Arabs ranks as the Jews' number one problem. Israel has difficulty staying within the frontier established by the United Nations, frontiers which left large numbers of Jews in Arab territory, while many Arabs remained in Israel. Jerusalem, the city through which the Israeli-Jordanian border runs, bears the brunt of the problem.

Neighboring Arab countries never have been reconciled even to the existence of a state of Israel, a point that raises a question pregnant with religious implications: Is independent Israel a fixture in Palestine? Are the Jews there to stay?

Last year more than 71,000 Jewish immigrants were received into Israel (only 180 of them were from the United States). The population has increased from 600,000 at the time of the end of the British mandate to about 2,000,000.

Does the current influx of Jews into a new Israel truly represent a scriptural preliminary to the second coming of Jesus Christ? Many dispensationalists think so. Others feel that the promise to Abraham concerning the land was conditioned upon obedience and that the Jews were oppressed in the land or driven out of it because of disobedience.

Some claim that possession of Jerusalem has tremendous significance; the opposing view can be stated this way: A believing Jew is just as near heaven in Jersey City as he would be in Jerusalem; an unbelieving Jew is as far from heaven in Jerusalem as if he were in Jersey City.

Whatever appraisal is more accurate, Israel still needs her Messiah! Evangelization in the Palestine area seems to hold a priority in the minds of Christians, yet the fruit is small. At last count, there were only 45,000 Christians in Israel, and almost all of them were Arabs. Some Hebrews profess Christ secretly, but only a handful publicly proclaim him as Saviour. Christian churches number 160.

Interested Christians will soon get a new opportunity to testify in person to twentieth century Israelites. A new Israel-American Institute of Biblical Studies is being established in Jerusalem under the direction of Dr. G. Douglas Young.

Assessing A Crusade

Advertisers call it "the hard sell." Anthropologists call it "mana." Average people call it "sincerity." Christians of San Francisco insist on identifying it as the anointing of the Holy Spirit—God's special preparation of a man uniquely set apart as his messenger in troubled times. By whatever name, the bay area has been exposed to a man and a message that are having an effect totally out of proportion to the brevity of time involved.

It is difficult if not impossible to apprehend the effect of the evangelist *Billy Graham* on the people of his generation without coming to the Cow Palace and witnessing the nightly miracle. After New York it was felt that superlatives were exhausted; the crusade to end crusades had become history; San Francisco could be only an anticlimax.

Before the first week was out it was apparent, however, that the Billy Graham team was breaking new ground in the West. On Thursday, "Youth Night" of the second week, a new high of 1243 decisions was recorded. The first crusade of the satellite age gave evidence of a yearning of God that threatened to develop into a hunger riot. Not only the breath of spring, but the spiritual breath of revival was in the air.

Dr. Graham told 18,000 listeners just before his first telecast, "I believe God is going to do something deeper here than we have sensed in any of our crusades. It may be that during these spring and summer months this nation will go on its knees before God." Declared song-director *Cliff Barrows* as he prepared to lead a record-breaking 2500-voice choir, "This has surpassed anything we hoped for or even anything that we have ever seen." A reporter for the *San Francisco Chronicle* said, "We're giving this more coverage than we expected to. The size of the crowd demands it. It looks as if Protestants are getting rid of their inferiority complex around here." (The city of San Francisco lists 800,000 population, 40,000 Protestants.)

The team reported not only more counselors than New York, but a new level of counseling. Two hundred ministers sat through the instruction of *Charles Riggs* and *Lorne Sanny*; seven M.D.'s were enrolled in a single class. Said Riggs: "The counseling in the Cow Palace is the smoothest ever. We have more advisers than we ever had." Ushering reached a new high; according to assistant director *Bill Brown*, San Francisco had

more ushers at the start of its campaign than New York had at the end. "These men," he said, "have a depth of purpose; their spirit of cooperation is unusual."

Mounting statistics indicated that San Francisco will achieve new goals in television coverage (twice as many stations as New York), in churches cooperating, in bus transportation, in choir and counseling participation. New developments such as pastors' prayer groups, local church Bible classes, special bus committees, telephone brigades are mushrooming. Negro churches are more active. On the first Saturday night telecast Dr. Graham reported "the largest audience at an evangelistic service in the history of the Christian church."

There are other changes more difficult to assess. One is the change in Billy Graham himself. The evangelist said in Madison Square Garden that "Christ does not remove your problems; your problems may be even greater after you come to Christ, but you will have a capacity and power to face them." He is saying it more emphatically in San Francisco. If the whole world were to become Christian, he tells his audiences, there would still be problems. "Even in a Christian home there are tensions—but Christ creates an atmosphere in which

solutions can be worked out." This new emphasis cuts across a familiar criticism: that Graham poses too simple solutions for the issues of life.

Evident also is a more discerning analysis of the motives of some of his listeners, and a new attitude toward his brother ministers. "Some of the things I say will make you cringe," he told pastors at a breakfast the first week. "Just close your ears and eyes and wait for something you can agree with. I cannot devise a theology that will please all of you, for we come from different backgrounds."

What of the actual effect of the crusade upon individual lives? The Cow Palace "exhibit room" which has been taken over by the counselors has become a production-line of Christian love. The affectionate way these Westerners counsel each other is striking. One young man who responded to Graham's invitation gave his occupation as "thief and gambler." A salesman in a bar across from the Cow Palace saw the crowd, decided to have a look for himself, listened, and gave his life to Jesus Christ. A newly-released convict from Leavenworth, a girl from Czechoslovakia, a Dutch refugee mother, three girls—triplets—and their parents, a clean-up man at the Cow Pal-

PEOPLE: WORDS AND EVENTS

Awards: To *Lieutenant Colonel Roy H. Terry*, the "Air Force Chaplain of the Year" citation of the Reserve Officers Association . . . To *Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert*, retired U. S. executive secretary of the World Council of Churches, the 1958 "Upper Room" citation "for leadership in world Christian fellowship" . . . To *Methodist Bishop Arthur J. Moore* of Atlanta, the 1958 "Distinguished Service" citation of Georgia State College . . . To *Rochester, New York*, and *Worthington, Minnesota*, "World Brotherhood" citations.

Appointments: As commander of the Salvation Army in Ireland, *Colonel Muriel Booth-Tucker*, a granddaughter of the founder of the Salvation Army, *William Booth* . . . As president of the yet-to-be-organized Alaska Methodist University at Anchorage, the *Rev. Donald F. Ebright* of Chicago . . . As general director of United Church Men, *Samuel J. Patterson Jr.* of Richmond, Virginia.

Distribution: Of more than 14,500,000 Scripture portions in 271 languages during 1957, announced by the American Bible Society.

Development: Program of building to cost \$16,000,000 undertaken by Union Theological Seminary, largest interdenominational seminary in the world.

Election: As an associate superintendent in the Congregational Christian Church, *Miss Janice C. Bennett*, first woman named to such a high administrative post in the denomination's history.

Nomination: As chief of Air Force chaplains, *Brigadier General Terence P. Finnegan*, Roman Catholic priest. Confirmation to the post would elevate Chaplain Finnegan to the rank of major general. He is to succeed *Major General Charles I. Carpenter*, who has been named Protestant cadet chaplain of the Air Force Academy.

ace, a student for the Roman Catholic priesthood, a Ph.D.-holding college professor are among those who have already yielded to the Lord their lives. The gentle, dignified way in which these inquirers are handled—even to the small children—and the spirit of their united prayer of confession are unforgettable scenes.

One delegation came by train from Nashville, Tennessee, and stayed a week. Other plane and train excursions were scheduled by groups from New York, Georgia and the Carolinas. The "Youth Nights," Thursdays, and on week ends the crowds have been overflowing. To those on the scene it was clear that no newspaper, no broadcast or telecast could reproduce the spiritual milieu that is being created in the great auditorium. Says co-chairman *Carl Howie*, "Dr. Graham's greatest effectiveness is not so much in his sermons as in his moment of invitation. Then it becomes apparent how uniquely God is using him."

To watch these people of every race and color coming forward without pressure, quietly, reverently, some dabbing at their eyes with a handkerchief, all soberly, is to recognize that here is a work of sheer mercy that is unmatched in the world of our times. They come not to fill their stomachs or to cure an ache or an infection, but to lay their sins and their griefs on the Lamb of God.

Last year columnist *John Crosby* predicted in a telecast entitled "The Revivalists" that within two years Billy Graham's popularity would begin to wane. San Francisco was providing little comfort for the prognostication.

S. E. W.

Tour of Russia

Interested in going on a tour of Russia?

The opportunity presents itself in a summer seminar which incorporates visits to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

The seminar is led by *Dr. Charles F. Boss*, executive secretary for United Nations and Intergovernmental affairs of the Board of World Peace of the Methodist church. The group will leave New York by plane July 22 and will return a day or two after Labor Day.

Invitations for inquiries have been extended to "clergymen, professors, graduate students and competent laymen." The New York office of the Board of Peace is in Room 1016, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

RELIGION IN A FREE SOCIETY

Seeking "civic unity" in the midst of "religious pluralism," the so-called Big Four in American life (Protestants, Catholics, Jews, non-religious humanists) met May 5-9 in New York for a Fund for the Republic seminar to discuss and debate "Religion in a Free Society." Provocative monologues by speakers of disparate viewpoints (*Dr. Robert M. Hutchins*, the Rev. *John Courtney Murray*, *Dr. Leo Pfeffer*, *Dr. Will Herberg*, *Dr. James Hastings Nichols*, *Rabbi Abraham Heschel*, the Rev. *Gustave Weigel*, *Dr. Paul Tillich* and others) propelled the 100 invited participants into dialogic discussion almost spiritlessly genteel at the outset but so ominously polemic by the third night that director *John Cogley* diagnosed an unscheduled three-hour autopsy of Protestant-Catholic tensions as a "rump session" rather than a technical aspect of the "dialogue."

Rump meeting or not, the Wednesday night flurry marked a climax which the scheduled sessions failed to rival until the closing hours. With more than half the participants present, Roman Catholic and Protestant clergy and lay leaders engaged in spirited debate, frankly bared their anxieties, and hopefully looked to the future for solution.

Broad issues in national life shaped the five-day program: the meaning of separation of church and state, religion and education, censorship. These themes were prosecuted from diverse points of view. Shifting emphases reflected the cultural tension between supernaturalism and secularism, between Protestantism and Catholicism, as well as measurable disagreement within each religious grouping, American Jewry included. The attempt to delineate American life as a synthesis of supernaturalists (as by the National Council of Christians and Jews) was under fire by the non-religious humanists from the outset. Both the Western sequence of Jewish, Catholic and Protestant history as well as the American accommodation of Protestant traditions to enlarging Catholic and Jewish influence, had now to reckon with secularism. On the opening night *Father Murray* noted that civic unity would be much simpler "if our society were all Protestant, or all Catholic, or all Jewish, or all secularist"—he even called the secularist "a late comer" who owes his existence to the rejection of Christian values, and warned of the "intellectual barbarianism" of the age. He acknowledged, however, that civil order now requires a pattern of interlocking "conspiracies" united for a com-

mon end. The decline of the nation, said more than one, may stem from inter-religious disharmony as easily as from irreligious solidarity.

Partisans of an "absolute separation" of church and state gained early momentum from *Dr. Leo Pfeffer* (who had represented the American Jewish Congress in the McCollum case and against Gideon Bible distribution in New Jersey). He warned that religious compromises (like "so help me God" in oaths, "in God we trust" on coins, "under God" in the pledge of allegiance; required chapel attendance at West Point) supply precedents that will nullify American freedoms and dissolve the Bill of Rights. He urged swift removal of "these impairments . . . lest they supply a precedent for inverting the whole intention of the First Amendment." *Dr. Pfeffer* called the historic prohibition of a law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" a "uniquely American contribution to civilization. . . . When our constitutional fathers formalized this concept . . . they imposed on future generations . . . a great moral obligation to preserve their experiment and to adhere strictly to the principle they expressed."

Episcopalian *Dr. Wilber G. Katz* of the University of Chicago Law School argued that "absolute separation" is "not supported unequivocally" by American historical and legislative traditions ("except for occasional flights of rhetoric, no one urges . . . this was intended"). He invoked the tradition of chaplains and of prayers in public life as establishing not a deviation but a principle of religious neutrality. *President John A. Mackay* of Princeton Theological Seminary commented that American tradition favors "the development of religion, but it may not promote religion." *Dr. Katz* demurred: "It favors religious liberty, not religion; it should keep the exercise of its power out of the way." *Dr. Will Herberg* of Drew University contended that religious institutions are entitled to government support in principle; however, the attempt to rationalize American practices is stifling: in the face of religious plurality "the Supreme Court has articulated a series of irrationalities . . . We are a religious people, but the government must not go 'too far.' Public opinion determines the appropriate limits according to time, place and circumstance."

With an eye on Roman Catholicism, many Protestant speakers stressed that the First Amendment excludes the Cath-

olic correlation of state and church, while some Roman Catholic participants protested any association of the amendment with a specifically Protestant theology. Dr. Pfeffer had argued that the American form of government is "the result of an alliance between Protestant dissent and secular humanism" (a designation of Jefferson and the Deists especially palatable to contemporary humanists), that "Judaism has accepted this alliance and become one of its sturdiest supporters," that the alliance "is today challenged by a Roman Catholic philosophy."

Protestant-Catholic Tensions

Discussion between Romanism and Protestantism heightened with the question whether Roman Catholic parochial education [Father Murray had said the first night that in respect to this an American injustice was now being committed in the distribution of public benefits] involves a system of values basically anti-democratic and somehow competitive with the American political philosophy. Editor Carl F. H. Henry of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* proposed a sustained exchange of thought on Protestant-Catholic anxieties. Dr. James Hastings Nichols of the University of Chicago's Federated Theological Faculty characterized Roman parochial schooling as "censored and irresponsible education." "Protestants hear the argument for distributive justice with one ear, as an artificial formulation of a real problem," he said. "The crux . . . is free education (of the dialogue) and censored education (intellectual segregation). Roman Catholic education is censored education; is irresponsible education (not subject to the review of the community); and is sacrosanct (its substantive content cannot be criticized) . . . Hence its graduates are crippled as participants in the great dialogue of modern life and . . . in the civic dialogue." He bluntly called "the expansion of Roman Catholic controlled education a major threat to a free society."

With this turn of events, group feeling ran high. The Rev. Neil G. McCluskey of *America*, who thought any special scrutiny of Catholic positions an "impertinent suggestion," resented any reflection "on the quality of the citizenship of the Catholic body," a phrasing that recalled Father Murray's earlier sally that to a Catholic war veteran whenever the prejudice appears that Catholics are "among us but not of us . . . them's fighting words!" After the coffee break, Father McCluskey announced: "It seems we really don't fit . . . and we are leaving. . . . I'm busy getting names to get on the

boat!" Inviting attendance at the National Catholic Education Association, and a reading of Catholic self-criticisms of parochial education, he added that Catholic institutions meet state requirements and are fully eligible to confer diplomas.

Paul Blanshard of Protestants and Other Americans United called discrimination against public schools, the hierarchy's official establishment of parochial schools, undemocratic control, restrictions against texts critical of Catholic doctrines and traditions "undemocratic features" of the parochial schools.

As discussion increased, the special Protestant-Catholic conclave appeared inevitable. The Very Rev. George G. Higgins of National Catholic Welfare Conference dissociating himself "from a sort of hurt feeling," said he was "not in the least offended by Dr. Nichols' talk. The majority of Catholics welcome this type of talk if we have time . . ." He drew from Dr. Nichols the admission that he had not extensively examined Catholic schools. He assailed any notion that Catholics engage in "calculated slander of public schools" ("Is it any more severe," he asked, "than slander of Catholic schools by secular educators and fundamentalist Protestant groups?").

Dr. Edward A. Dowey Jr. of Princeton Seminary emphasized that criticism of Romanism is socio-political, not theological. "It involves authority, solidarity and comprehensiveness (Cont'd on p. 34)

Worth Quoting

"I am aghast as the Harwell Thinkometer, which by a system of buttons placed before each member of a group, permits group decisions without the embarrassment of discussion. You press a button, yes, no, or maybe; and the machine calculates the total reaction.

"I am aghast at the Dynamulator, which is alleged to be able to teach you through your pillow while you sleep. Without any intellectual effort, you may learn to be an aggressive salesman, or to speak Russian.

"I am even more terrified by the Dial-A-Prayer movement, by which a machine performs your devotions for you, and you do not have to make any personal exertion to get in touch with the Deity beyond giving Him a ring."—Dr. Robert M. Hutchins on "Religion in a Free Society," at a seminar sponsored by the Fund for the Republic.

Which Way Now?

Senate Commerce Committee hearings had hardly begun when the adverse odds became evident. At stake was a bill to ban interstate liquor advertising. Similar measures had died in committee during the last nine Congresses.

"Is the bill constitutional?" The question had already been raised, Committee Chairman Warren G. Magnuson observed in opening remarks. The Democratic Senator from Washington also noted quickly that several federal agencies were on record against the bill, namely the Departments of State and Commerce and the Postmaster General. The Department of Justice declined to comment on the merits of the bill, but pointed out that such a law might favor foreign liquor dealers over domestic interests. The Interstate Commerce Commission took no position other than recommending an exemption for common and contract carriers if the bill was to be favorably reported to the floor of the Senate. No endorsements came from any administrative government source; neither was there any comment from the White House.

The first morning's testimony opened before 13 of the 15 members on the committee. Subsequent committee attendance never approached that figure, and at times only the chairman and one other member were present. Even the bill's sponsor, Republican Senator William Langer of North Dakota, missed much of the testimony.

"I made extra efforts to have committee members here," said Chairman Magnuson. "They don't seem to be interested or something, I don't know."

Committee members found it difficult to attend primarily because afternoon hearings were held simultaneously with Senate sessions. The committee still gets a chance to study testimony, for all remarks are subsequently published in a comprehensive report.

The biggest obstacle for the bill was brought out pointedly in a sharp exchange between Senator Magnuson and Dr. Charles X. Hutchinson Jr., general superintendent of the International Reform Federation and president of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council:

HUTCHINSON: The bottling up of this legislation in this committee session after session raises up a question about the democratic process. Unfortunately, thousands of our citizens have blamed their senators because the liquor advertising bill has not been passed. It is difficult to

explain that the bill has perished in committee and that their senators never have had a crack at it. I urge the committee, in the name of democracy, to report this bill at long last to the Senate—favorably or unfavorably. Then if the Senate as a whole is unwilling to do anything about this vicious liquor advertising business, the people will know it and will fasten the blame where it belongs. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hearing you have given me, and urge this committee to report S. 582 to the Senate, favorably I hope, and facilitate its consideration by that distinguished body.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Hutchinson, this committee is composed of 15 members. Any time eight of the fifteen want to report this bill, or any other bill, favorably or unfavorably, it will be reported.

HUTCHINSON: I recognize that, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have taken votes in the committee on this bill on several occasions, and the votes have always been against reporting it, favorably or unfavorably, and that is the democratic process of the United States Senate.

HUTCHINSON: I recognize that, Senator. I did want to raise the point, and perhaps I did it in a little bold fashion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know the processes of legislation.

HUTCHINSON: That is correct. But, sir, I did want the members of this committee to know that there is a feeling abroad in the minds of many people that the Senate as a whole has refused to pass on this measure when as a matter of fact they have never had the opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is up to the people who understand that to tell them otherwise. Many of the senators have received telegrams, and the word "bottled" is used in the telegrams, a little perversely in this case. This committee functions on all pieces of legislation. Any time eight members of this committee, a majority, want to bring up a bill or pass it out, the bill is passed out, favorably or unfavorably. I would suggest, maybe, that you find the eight members.

HUTCHINSON: Thank you, sir. That is what we are trying to do today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions of Dr. Hutchinson?

There were none.

Proponents spent much of their time pleading the evils inherent in the use of alcohol. They appealed to the consciences of the legislators, and while such presentations may have carried some weight, the senators appeared more concerned over the bill's legal ramifications.

"The problem is a legislative one," said Magnuson who, at another point in the

proceedings, had extra words of appreciation for a legal brief filed by Dr. Edward B. Dunford, legal adviser for the National Temperance League.

A number of witnesses called for legislation to prohibit all liquor advertising because it can be considered false and misleading. Magnuson commented that if this was the case, remedial authority was then in the hands of the Federal Trade Commission and the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Internal Revenue Service. He conceded, however, that there is precedent for congressional legislation in cases where administrative agencies fail to act even when given proper authority.

Langer's bill would not ban liquor advertising per se. It would outlaw liquor advertising which crosses state borders. Liquor advertising in the mails and on the air would be prohibited. Though national magazines could no longer carry alcohol promotion, local carrier-delivered newspapers could.

Opponents of the bill charge that this would amount to discrimination, that the result would be a shift from national to local advertising, that interstate liquor businesses would be losing out while local interests flourished.

How good were the chances that the bill would get to the floor of the Senate? Liquor interests did not seem worried in an election year. Even temperance leaders did not seem too hopeful, but they did see the hearings themselves as a force for good. They were serving public notice on the alcoholic beverage industry that advertising needed to be restrained.

Among those who testified in favor of the bill were several congressmen, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Dr. George W. Crane, and Dr. Sam Morris. Methodist Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker introduced the proponents.

Placed on record against the bill were brewery officials, liquor group leaders, labor representatives, the publisher of the American Legion magazine, advertising legal advisers, and the National Association of Broadcasters.

Free Organs

Spinnet model electric organs are being given away to 700 needy churches in Ohio by a retired 85-year-old Cleveland industrialist at a cost of about half a million dollars.

The organs which retail at \$1,300 each are going to churches of more than a dozen denominations in the state's 88 counties. Installation of the organs will be at the rate of 15 a week.

Philanthropist Claude Foster, the donor, first offered to give away about

500 organs on a first-come, first-served basis. But in four months he received about 1,200 appeals from Ohio churches and hundreds from out of state. Said he: "I only wish I had enough money to give an organ to everyone who asked."

In 1957 Foster became ill and promised that if he recovered he would do something "in the Lord's service." The organ gifts are the fulfillment of that promise.

College Move

Furman University, the South's oldest Baptist college, will move next fall to a new 1,200-acre campus five miles north of Greenville, South Carolina, in sight of the Blue Ridge mountains. The liberal arts institution, founded in 1826, will have expended some 8 million dollars on building and grounds by moving day and plans to spend \$14,900,000 more for its complete program, providing accommodations for 2,500 students. T. M.

ACCC Meeting

At a semi-annual national meeting in South Carolina last month, the American Council of Christian Churches espoused the conservative South's view of segregation and called on Protestants to oppose the election of a Roman Catholic president.

The council's executive committee also adopted a resolution endorsing the continuance of all nuclear tests "necessary to the defense of the United States from foreign attack."

An ACCC statement said segregation within the church on racial, linguistic and national lines is not unchristian.

Another of the group's statements said, "There are, no doubt, some Roman Catholics who would place their country before the wishes of the Roman hierarchy," but in view of Romanism's "religio-politic" character and record in Spain and South America, all identified with her "must be considered suspect."

The council's stand on nuclear tests drew sharp attacks from radio stations in Communist Hungary. The stations especially criticized Dr. Carl McIntire, president.

Council meetings were held in Greenville and at the nearby campus of Bob Jones University. Dr. Bob Jones, founder of the university, has been closely associated with the ACCC, along with author John R. Rice.

There were some heart-warming periods of testimony and inspiration. Many of the delegates bore the marks of suffering for the Gospel's sake; some expressed a longing for true revival. T. M.

Evangelism Mission

Some 160 Missouri Synod Lutheran congregations in western Iowa will participate in an October evangelistic mission. Never before has there been such "all-out" mobilization of a segment of the denomination's membership.

Forty-six per cent of western Iowans reportedly lack church affiliation. The Lutheran program seeks to make a thrust into this unevangelized area plus reaching delinquent church members.

In St. Louis this month, the Missouri Synod assigned 901 new full-time workers to teaching and preaching posts. The workers are graduates and undergraduates of the synod's 14 North American education institutions.

The 202 ministerial candidates assigned to various congregations and mission stations included 156 graduates from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, and 46 graduates from Concordia Seminary in Springfield, Illinois. Because there were not enough graduates to go around, an additional 22 requests went unfulfilled. The synod reported 258 bona fide vacancies in its 5,857 congregations.

CANADA

Church Progress

The cornerstone of the \$1,750,000 national headquarters building of the United Church of Canada in Toronto was laid this month by the denomination's first moderator, the Very Rev. George C. Pidgeon.

The church, meanwhile, reported that more than 700 men and women are studying in its colleges throughout the dominion, compared with 659 last year. This year's figure represents an all-time high.

T. W. H.

Montreal Morality

An inter-faith committee will make moral cleanup recommendations to the Montreal city council.

Long known as one of the "wide-open" cities of North America, Montreal was openly rebuked last January by Cardinal Paul Emile Leger for allowing objectionable night club shows and obscene literature. Growing sentiment prompted the cardinal to bring together a number of Protestant and Jewish leaders who joined in setting forth a manifesto "deploring the moral and spiritual conditions" of the city.

City fathers responded by ordering police to enforce rigidly both municipal and provincial laws governing closing

hours, liquor permits and types of shows. Some entertainment activities were curtailed.

Finally, a committee of Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews was appointed to investigate local cabaret shows and obscene literature.

W. S. R.

EUROPE

Seal of Disapproval

A matter of principle placed a brick wall between the Rev. Umberto Righetti and his congregation in Fondi, Italy.

Pastor Righetti had rented two rooms in an ancient castle for a church. The only entrance led through the apartment of Mrs. Gemma Rasile, a Roman Catholic who soon decided she objected to continuing intrusion. A court ruling gave Mrs. Rasile permission to have the only door leading to the church apartment walled in, and the pastor tried to have a new doorway cut, but the Italian General Superintendent for Fine Arts denied a permit on the grounds that the door would "ruin the palace."

This month the showdown came. As bricklayers arrived, the pastor declared he would not abandon the premises as a "matter of principle." Sealed in his church apartment, Righetti conducted his next service through the window to an outdoor congregation. Parishioners supplied food with the help of a 20-foot rope and a bucket. He said he was confident that "sooner or later" the door would be reopened.

Righetti's predication came true. Three days later Mrs. Rasile relented and a doorway was hacked open by a mason.

"It was the only reasonable way to put an end to all this fuss," she said.

Native's Return

Evangelist William P. Nicholson's return to his native Ireland recalled memories of a remarkable movement of the Spirit of God in the early twenties. The 82-year-old Nicholson has been living in Glendale, California. He returned to Northern Ireland for a series of evangelistic missions during the summer and autumn.

In a television interview, evangelist Nicholson referred to some of the missions held in Belfast in the early twenties when conversions led to large scale restitution. He received a letter from a firm which could not find adequate room to store stolen tools being returned.

Nicholson was ordained by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in 1914.

S. W. M.

WHEATON SUMMER SESSIONS



OFFER STRONG EMPHASIS ON
SCIENCE STUDIES
June 10 to Aug. 16

You'll find the Wheaton science courses rewarding. New air-conditioned library and chemistry building make study a pleasure. A wide range of courses in the liberal arts and sciences are taught at Wheaton, Black Hills Science Station, and Honey Rock Camp. Also special work in teacher training, Graduate School of Theology, and Conservatory of Music.

Attend 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10 weeks

Free Tuition to pastors, full-time Christian workers and alumni for the Inter-Session, June 10-20.

SEND FOR FREE BULLETIN

Write: Director of Summer School, Dept. 58-CT

WHEATON COLLEGE • Wheaton, Illinois

RETIRED? LIVE IN HAWAII!

JACKSON COLLEGE IN HONOLULU, HAWAII, needs a professor with an earned doctorate in English and speech. If you are interested, write to 2655 Manoa Road, Honolulu, T. H. Hawaii.

WANTED POSITION:

Artist-Teacher seeks to teach in a church-sponsored school or college. Protestant, with family, church painter, has taught mural design, painting, draughtsmanship. Some theological background. Write

CHRISTIANITY TODAY, Box JGO

USED & NEW BOOKS

Dogmatics, Bible Study, Worship, Devotional, Pastoralia, Church History, Patristics, Roman Controversy, etc.

If you buy British books direct you save 50% to 70%. Lists Free

IAN MICHELL

29 LOWER BROOK ST.

IPSWICH, SUFFOLK, ENGLAND

PEWS, PULPIT & CHANCEL FURNITURE

✓ WRITE FOR FREE CATALOG
AND LOW DIRECT PRICES
J.P. REDINGTON & Co.

DEPT. 222, SCRANTON 2, PA.

FAUSSET'S BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA and DICTIONARY

by A. R. Fausset

DR. WILBUR M. SMITH "... the most satisfactory ..." \$5.95

A Zondervan Publication
ORDER FROM YOUR BOOK STORE



FREE SOCIETY

(Cont'd from p. 31) What worries me is the socio-political implications of a large group in society subject to dictates of the church in matters of the body politic . . . From this issues a kind of front expressive of an official church opinion within a free society. Moreover, the Roman church seeks to be more fully related to culture in its own particular way (Catholic veterans, Catholic nurses, and so on). Such a large bloc . . . isolated from 'the dialogue' reduces to a power bloc in society, hence the danger of ruining 'the dialogue' is clear if not yet present . . ." President Mackay asked "what could happen" if the classical Roman Catholic view of religious freedom (and freedom in general) and of church-state relations "were to become dominant in the U.S.A. and if the state were to subsidize their schools and make them contributory to the triumph of that view . . . which assumes and proclaims the superiority and authority of one particular church over the state and society wherever the Roman church represents the dominant view?"

Roman Catholic participants in turn asked: what values should be taught by all educational enterprises?

Although discussion continued in a psychological and emotional atmosphere that "sounds cool and dry but feels volatile," the issues waited for head-on debate until after the evening reception and buffet dinner. During the day, several priests had already indicated that the Roman church is re-examining its church-state position, and now values religious freedom in a way heretofore unrecognized. (Pope Leo XIII wrote: "Although in the extraordinary conditions of these times the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to permit them, she would in happier times exercise her own liberty." In the encyclical of 1885, Leo XIII also said: "It is not lawful for the State to hold in equal favor different kinds of religion.") President Mackay acknowledged that some Roman Catholic scholars repudiate this dominant view as an historical accident and not an essential expression of the inner logic of the church. Would Roman Catholicism in the U.S.A., he asked, repudiate the historic view and give an absolute guarantee of religious freedom?

This issue was prominent in the night meeting on Protestant-Catholic tensions, moderated by a humanist. Asked for an opening statement, Dr. Henry noted that

the work of scholars like Father Weigel and Father Murray who are now seeking to adjust its application to meet the unique political situation in America is tacit admission of conflicting interests in the present Roman church-state formula. He said ten per cent of the Roman clergy and an even greater proportion of the laity in the United States are now said to favor the more liberal view. Paul Blanshard stated that the Vatican has in principle repudiated the view of the German Jesuit Gundlach (that the church-state thesis is not final but rather one of several possible theses). Catholic spokesmen admitted "there is a crisis in Catholic thought in this field . . . We do not know the main thrust for the future . . . But if Protestants push too hard, the answer may not be what we want."

Catholic participants protested what "seemed" an uncharitable disposition to put them "on the spot"; to them the Protestant expression of "vague and unprecise fears" was "amusing" and due to "lack of Protestant comprehension." Dr. Martin Marty of *The Christian Century* ascribed these fears to Protestantism's quest for security in a day of shifting political balance and asked "what background explains this 'nameless, faceless dread'?" Dr. Pfeffer noted Rome's attempts "to utilize the coercive arm of the state."

Catholic leaders said they were targets of two unreasonable demands: first, that they subscribe to the political notion (of Reinhold Niebuhr, whose participation during the week was precluded by illness) that religious freedom requires a theology of doubt; and second, that the Roman Catholic as a man becomes secular by divorcing himself from religious commitment in his social actions. In a summary statement ending the almost three-hour session Dr. Henry called these problems not the actually central issues (the early Americans whose consciences were informed by Scripture, he said, "were not representatives of a theology of doubt," and theological commitment properly and even inevitably reflects itself in social attitudes and actions); rather, the main concern is the authority the Roman church assumes in the political order and its corollary authority over the conscience of its members in socio-political affairs. "The question is not one of affection and love for Roman Catholics—priests and laity—as individuals; it is a matter of concern over organization. The Roman church is a principled church, and its principles and their application are at stake." He noted appreciatively the statements by contemporary Catholic

scholars of the traditional church-state thesis, but pointed out that "the determination of the hierarchy's official doctrine does not lie with these scholars."

Two days of the seminar's larger dialogue remained. James O'Gara, editor of *The Commonwealth*, voiced private anxiety lest excesses on both sides of the recent debate had opened wounds that now required time for healing. Most participants felt, however, that while sometimes intemperate, the exchange cleared some differences, and marked an advance over repressed feelings. But when the Rev. Walter Ong of St. Louis University framed his discussion of religion and society in personalistic rather than Thomistic categories, Professor James Luther Adams of Harvard Divinity School renewed the inquiry: Does Roman Catholicism grant the right of voluntary secular associations to be freely formed and to exist? Does it promote free personal relations? Does the nature of Catholic authority allow this in the structure of that church? Father McCluskey replied that Catholic conscience does not cease to be free when it is voluntarily informed by the authority of the church, and that nothing in the U. S. Constitution is repugnant to a Catholic commitment.

With Protestants obviously leading the thrust for democratic values, the Rev. Raymond T. Bosler of *The Indiana Catholic and Record* proposed that a half hour be allotted the last day in the general sessions for a recital of Catholic fears. ("In protecting the Protestant *status quo*, Protestantism in relation to its own principles seems to bend backwards in defending secularists . . . Protestants hold they can reverse themselves . . . and lack stable principles of morality . . .") But the following day, when President Mackay urged that Roman Catholics be given a full opportunity for "an expression of concerns regarding Protestant attitudes and positions," Father McCluskey of *America* disowned any anxieties or worries about "what Protestants will do to Catholics" and Father Bosler waved aside the opportunity ("I simply wanted to reflect some of the emotions we Catholics feel . . . so that for a second you were 'on the spot'"). Norman St. John-Stevae of Yale University, nonetheless admonished fellow Catholics: "We must beware of being carried away by a tidal wave of metaphysical good will. Criticism of the Roman Catholic church bulks large . . . This gives the American Catholic a solemn warning that the image created in the American mind is that of a power structure rather than of the Church of Christ." (Cont'd on p. 39)

Books in Review

ONE RELIGION?

The Coming World Civilization, by William Ernest Hocking, Harper, 1956. \$3.75.

The first, shortest, and I believe the best section of this small book concerns "The Impotence of the State." Clarity and force characterize Professor Hocking's argument that a state depends on a motivation it cannot supply. A secular state cannot control crime: punishment presupposes that the criminal recognizes the justice of the penalty, but the state cannot produce a sense of justice. Nor can the state educate: teachers must have moral standards, but the state does not furnish them. All the less can the state safeguard the family. The state can, and Professor Hocking thinks that the state ought to control the economic life of the nation, but it cannot make prosperity produce contentment. Although the author repudiates the idea of unalienable rights, on which our nation was founded, he sees that the state cannot protect or create the conditions on which any rights exist. A "church" therefore is needed to supply the motivation that the state cannot give.

Despite the deficiencies of the state the author is apparently none the less a socialist. He equates individualism with solipsism and constructs some clever but not too convincing arguments against the latter. As a philosophic essay this second part of the book is highly entertaining.

The third section on the merging of the several historic civilizations into one civilization prepares the ground for the fourth section on the universalization of Christianity.

No religion can any longer remain 'local' (i.e., particular or distinctive). "Jealous gods and chosen people are normal chiefly within an accepted polytheism no longer thinkable" (p. 81). The particularity of Christianity, expressed in the phrases 'he that loseth his life for my sake' and 'ye have done it unto me,' he empties of any definite meaning by reducing them to "the affirmative power of a purposeful devotion" (pp. 90, 94). Similarly on a later page he writes, "The doctrine of Incarnation [note the omission of the definite article] could be defined as a generality whose role it is to escape from generality, accepting the responsibility of the universal for realization in the particular" (pp. 180-181).

To justify the merging of Christianity with Buddhism and the other religions, Dr. Hocking argues that "Affirmation is not exclusion. . . . Christian faith does not present itself as an hypothesis competing with other hypotheses. . . . 'This way is a way of peace.' As affirmative, it is not exclusive" (pp. 137-138). There is an 'Only Way,' but "The Only Way so far as its essence has by valid induction achieved finality is no longer the Way that marks out one religion from all others: it is the Way *already present in all*, either explicitly or *in ovo*. The several universal religions are *already fused together, so to speak, at the top*. . . . The religions of mankind—Buddhism not excluded—are already one religion" (p. 149; ital. his).

Now, in criticism, there are two things I should like to say, only one of which there is room for. It would take a treatise to argue that there is no such thing as religion. There are religions, but there is no intellectual or even emotional content both common and meaningfully definite in all. A particular definite religion may become geographically universal, but the philosophic universal 'religion' is another night in which all cows are black.

Second, Professor Hocking's reinterpretation of Christianity is neither objective nor historically accurate. "For my sake" must not be reduced to the empty verbalism of "the affirmative power of a purposeful devotion." There are too many incompatible devotions. Nor can one honestly equate "No man cometh unto the Father but by me" with a Way that is already present in Buddhism. In this case the affirmation is most definitely an exclusion. And the statement, "The faith of the Christian is continuous with the nature faith by which all men live" (p. 113) is simply false.

GORDON H. CLARK

JEWISH PHILOSOPHY

Pointing the Way, by Martin Buber, Harper, 1957. 239 pp. \$4.50.

Jewish philosopher Martin Buber is easily one of the most brilliant and multifariously gifted men of the twentieth century. By his writings alone, he has touched creatively and with remarkable incisiveness nearly every fundamental sphere of human activity concurrent to Western Europe and the Near East. And as he becomes increasingly recognized by thinkers in this country, it is possible that

his impress upon the same will be equally outstanding.

At present he is professor emeritus of social philosophy at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Beyond this, his interests embrace modern theology and the Jewish faith, poetry and drama, aesthetics, sociology, education, psychiatry, political philosophy and, of course, the manner in which his own ideology of "genuine dialogue" answers the need of man and his relationship to these things.

Pointing the Way comprises 29 essays, translated from the German, and recording Dr. Buber's thoughts and responses to these several complexities. Space does not permit even a cursory treatment of these essays, but the mentioning of a few of his basic convictions may place in perspective something of the author's world and life view.

As the title suggests, Martin Buber recognizes himself as a leader and a teacher (the one without the other, he believes, destroys all that makes human life seem worth living). "In our age," he says, "powerful transformations are accomplished through individuals who are not equal to the deeds they bring about . . . they are, in fact, only the exploiters of a situation . . . A man without restraint who arises and cries, 'I will show you a way, finds a following and attains success. [But] he knows no way, he points to none, he marches without direction and the masses follow" (p. 158). He is, in short, "the contradiction between being and appearance" (p. 158). Throughout the essays of this book, the inference is clear that the author regards himself as no "contradiction." He is a man of clairvoyance who believes he knows the way, is pointing to it, and would have the reader follow him in it.

Dr. Buber's way is toward "true existence" to be found and experienced in the present moment (a perspective approaching that of Kierkegaard), and in the intensely personal encounter of the I and its Thou. He is opposed to the mysticism which he once held—an "all absorbing unity of [one's] own self . . . separate from every other self," and pleads for a spontaneous going forth of the whole or "unconditioned" Self (that "truly human" ideal which Goethe describes), to meet in unity and "love" the world of man, and Him who is above the world, God.

This concept of the "truly human" seems to be one which Buber not only acquires from Goethe but also, perhaps, from the less detestable side of Nietzsche's doctrine, "the superman." In the thinking of all three, there runs a picture of a "true" Man who is conceived as an

ideal harmony of both the dynamic, infra-rational and the spiritual-ethical rational-sides of human nature. And in the mind of Buber, this ideal is something that may, yea must, be realized in every man if he would experience "genuine life"—that unconditioned unity of virtue and body (or, better stated, the spiritual irradiated through the sensuous), and also "genuine dialogue"—the abandoning of this integrated Self in love toward others and toward God. The reviewer suggests that perhaps what Buber desires to see, in Christian terminology, are "saved" men, reconciled to God without Christ, and made perfect in the flesh.

It is within the I and Thou relationship, of course, that man finds truth; although he explains this is not to relativize it: "ultimate truth is one, but is given to man only as he enters, reflected as in a prism, into the true life relationships of persons" (p. 79). And it is within this meeting, this other name for history, that Buber believes man can eventually discover the potentialities for world peace.

As with any thoroughgoing existentialist, as well as humanist in his own stripe, many of Dr. Buber's concepts are at variance with historical Christianity. He does not, in fact, pretend to be a Christian, for his underlying theology appears as something of an Emil Brunner variety of neo-orthodoxy in Judaism. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that to contemporary thinking he has offered an incisive contribution in his creative emphasis upon love. Love is a unique responsibility of an I for a Thou. "Each man you meet needs help, each needs *your* help . . . [and] even when you yourself are in need—and you are—you can help others and, in so doing, help yourself" (p. 110).

Martin Buber possesses extraordinary skill in writing. His literary style varies according to the mood of the essay, which at times is straightforward and penetrating, and in places poetic and often musical.

MARIAN J. CAINE

SUBJECTIVISM

Jesus and His Coming, by J. A. T. Robinson, Abingdon, 1957. 192 pp., \$4.

Jesus is not coming to earth again. The idea of a literal second coming of Christ was an early development in Christian thinking, but Jesus did not teach it himself. By the time of I Thessalonians, only 20 years after Calvary, the Church had applied Old Testament apocalyptic symbols to the expectation of Christ's triumph, and the outcome was the mistaken doctrine of the Lord's per-

sonal return in glory. What Jesus meant by his coming was that he would be vindicated over his enemies, would come to the place of honor at his Father's throne, would from there continue the victorious campaign inaugurated when he was on earth until at last all things should be summed up in him.

If you ask how such a thesis can possibly be supported, J. A. T. Robinson replies that much material in the Gospels was not part of the "primitive tradition." It is only the materials of secondary value that contain apocalyptic elements. The path of analysis is marked by the recurrence of this type of phrase: "generally established principles of New Testament criticism," "demonstrably editorial introductions . . . rather than words of Jesus," "isolated, and on critical grounds, rather dubious, sayings (of Jesus)." Plainly, subjectivism is still a prominent quality in New Testament critics.

It is of note that the trend, so assisted by study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, toward a higher appreciation of the Gospel of John is evidenced in this book. Dr. Robinson favors a fairly early date for John and finds much of the "primitive tradition" in the Fourth Gospel.

J. A. T. Robinson belongs to a school of scholarship to which the idea of inspiration is irrelevant. The mind of Christ, the teaching of the New Testament become plastic in such hands and strange forms appear. ROBERT STRONG

AN APOLOGETIC

Cooperative Evangelism, by Robert O. Ferm, Zondervan, 1958. 100 pp., 75¢.

As a study of historic evangelism this book will be of interest because of its analysis of the methods used by evangelists from the time of John Wesley to Billy Graham.

As an apologetic for cooperative evangelism the book reveals a situation in American church life which needs exposing and correcting. Because this controversy centers in Billy Graham, his message and his policies, Dr. Ferm has done a considerable amount of research work, and this is reflected by an unusually long bibliography with notes and references, all of which help lift the discussion out of the realm of personal opinion and into one of historical fact.

Opposition to Billy Graham comes from the two theological extremes: extreme liberals reject Graham because they have already rejected the Gospel which he preaches. On the other hand, extreme fundamentalists claim to accept the Gospel but they vociferously attack Graham

because of his willingness to preach under any sponsorship so long as there shall be no restrictions of any kind on the message he preaches.

As a rule the extreme liberal tends to ignore Graham. It is true that there have been some caustic references to his preaching but usually the criticisms are temperate and objective.

This is not true for the extreme fundamentalists. Some of them seem obsessed with the determination to "tear Graham down," and the language used, the willingness to distort and the energy and time used in writing articles, letters and broadcasting attacks is in itself evidence of their tenuous position.

Dr. Ferm writes: "Those who are in disagreement with the inclusive policy of Billy Graham have repeatedly mentioned the major evangelists—Whitefield, Wesley, Finney, Moody and Sunday—intimating that Graham's cooperative policy is novel as well as unscriptural. They would leave the impression that from Jonathan Edwards to Billy Sunday not one of them evinced a tendency to include in their evangelistic campaigns those who had not been proven orthodox. Some of the opposing articles imply that these leaders in evangelism actually investigated the participants in their crusades in order to eliminate the heterodox from sponsoring responsibilities.

"Convincing indeed are the historical records of the methods and associations of these proclaimers of Christ. Sponsorship of campaigns was the least of their concern, and sponsorship and cooperation is the crux of the entire controversy that is carried on today by the hyper-fundamentalist spokesmen.

"In order to give strength to a campaign against Billy Graham and inclusivism they have often been guilty of serious errors in the use of historical records."

Chapter two gives an excellent definition of the meaning of evangelism, showing what it is and what it is not. Making certain distinctions between preaching and teaching we find in this particular chapter an effective answer to those who would have Graham step out of his role as an evangelist and into one of social reformer.

Regarding sin and judgment Dr. Ferm writes: "When a few have even said that there is an overemphasis upon sin and judgment in the preaching of Billy Graham, they overlook the fact that grace and mercy are best revealed against the dark background of sin and judgment. As Wesley somewhere stated: 'I preach the law in the strongest, the closest, the

most searching manner possible.' Only as the people became convinced of sin did he 'mix' more and more Gospel . . . to raise into spiritual life those whom the law had slain. This has been true of every major evangelist, and the confession of Moody is commonly known: 'I must not preach hell unless I can preach it with tears.'"

Chapter four, "Cooperative Evangelism in History" makes up almost one half of the entire book. This will prove invaluable to all who would know the position of the great evangelists of history. That Graham has followed in their steps is obvious to all who will face the array of evidence here presented.

The author begins his concluding chapter with these words: "Having examined the policy of Billy Graham from the perspective of history and the Scriptures, it has been shown that he is neither out of harmony with the major evangelists, nor is his policy contrary to the Scriptures. He has not conducted his crusades with the attitude of an opportunist, doing evil that good may come, but he has sought for both message and method in the Scriptures."

Later we read, "The transformed lives of both rich and poor, learned and illiterate, moral and immoral, ministers and laymen, all bear witness to the undiminished power of the Gospel that came to them because Billy Graham dared to enter in where separatists feared to go, and fearlessly proclaimed Christ as the answer to the need of the longing heart. What if he had insisted upon screening and excluding men of different opinions and views from his own, thereby excluding many who sensed their need?"

The opposition of the separatists probably stems from a number of motives, but it also evinces a very low estimate of the saving and keeping power of the Holy Spirit, and of the Church. Deploring the policy of permitting those who make decisions for Christ to "go to the church of their choice," they limit the power of the third Person of the Trinity.

There is also an ethical phase which they would ignore. Graham rightly feels that any pastor who cooperates in a crusade in which he knows the great historic doctrines of the Christian faith will be preached has the right to receive into his church those who make decisions and then so indicate their preference.

This controversy in which the separatists are so active assumes ridiculous proportions because, when analyzed, it places more importance on sponsorship than on the message itself. That our Lord gives ample precedents is ignored.

That Paul preached on Mars Hill under the sponsorship of the pagan Stoics and Epicureans is conveniently forgotten.

Dr. Ferm concludes with these words: "The cooperative policy of evangelism leaves the door open for the entrance of any and all who desire to have the Gospel preached with unparalleled effectiveness. Every true Christian has a great responsibility for being identified with the work of God. The words of Jesus are perennially true, 'He that gathereth not, scattereth.'"

"One of the tragedies of contemporary Christendom is that some once-honored and used evangelists, men who once knew the power of God in their preaching and whose altars were once filled with repentant sinners, no longer preach the Gospel with power, much of their time being apparently spent with others of like mind in concerted attack on some of God's servants. By word of mouth and printed page there continues to pour forth a volume of criticism, abuse and even distortion which must bring great joy to the enemies of the Cross.

"Most important of all, these are days when Christians should join hands in prayer for every fruitful work of making Christ known. It is a time when we should unite in thanksgiving and praise, and in asking God's guiding and sustaining hand to rest on all who are preaching the unsearchable riches of his grace. Let us uphold and not hinder!"

The reviewer noted a few typographical errors in this book which will undoubtedly be corrected in future editions. In general, there is presented here most valuable historical data as well as a satisfying defense of cooperative evangelism.

H. B. DENDY

ARTIFICIAL CONSTRUCT

The Doctrine of the Trinity, by Cyril C. Richardson, Abingdon, 1958. 159 pp., \$3.

This is a lucidly written book in which Dr. Cyril C. Richardson, professor of church history at Union Seminary in New York, reveals his unalloyed antithesis to the fundamental biblical and historic Christian doctrine of the Trinity as set forth in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.

He believes that God has a paradoxical nature, the primary paradox being that God is both beyond the world and yet related to the world. He reluctantly uses the terms *Father* and *Son* to describe the two sides of the paradox. For him the word *Father* is a misleading symbol for the "aspect or mode of God's being" that is absolute, transcendent, be-

yond, and veiled. The word *Son* symbolizes that aspect of God's being that is related to the world and unveiled.

Richardson concludes that the Persons of the Trinity are after all not persons. For if the terms *Father* and *Son* symbolize two aspects of God's being, "it will at once be evident that we cannot equate God's beyondness and his relatedness with 'persons' in the Godhead, who love one another. . . . It really makes no sense to say that God as beyond loves God as related. . . . Aspects or modes of being do not love one another. It is persons as centers of self-consciousness, that love one another . . ." (p. 81). "Where Augustine introduces a real confusion is in attributing to all three persons of his Trinity the capacity to love. Persons may love, but relations cannot. . . . By personalizing the relations in his symbolism, he introduces untold confusion" (p. 103).

Richardson's basic presupposition as to the twofold nature of God leads him to deny the Holy Spirit. "The Spirit is not a 'thing,' over against God, but a way of expressing God in his relation to us" (p. 53). Thus "the Spirit is logically identical with the Logos" (p. 54), and the two terms "are metaphorical ways of talking about the same thing—God in his relation with the world" (p. 48). He recognizes that Paul "perpetually observes" this distinction between Son and Spirit, but "it is evident that Paul had not thought the matter fully through; consequently he introduced some inconsistency into his thinking" (p. 50). Naturally, then, for the author the doctrines of procession and the *filioque* "can no longer be regarded as legitimate theological issues" (p. 114).

Having abolished the symbol *Holy Spirit* and having poured an entirely new content into the terms *Father* and *Son*, Richardson then proceeds to do away with the terms. Rather than illuminate the meaning of God beyond and God related, the terms *Father* and *Son* becloud them (p. 26). For these symbols imply a priority of God's beyondness to God's relatedness, and a begetting of one by the other. But "it is doubtful that there is value in thinking of these two paradoxical aspects or 'modes of being' in God under terms which imply the one is derived from the other" (p. 25). "Beyondness is not in any sense prior to the relatedness, nor does it engender it. If it did engender it, it would no longer be the kind of absolute beyondness of which we are speaking" (p. 35).

Richardson's "conclusion, then, about the doctrine of the Trinity is that it is

an artificial construct. . . . There is no necessary threeness in the Godhead" (pp. 148-149).

From the foregoing it is clear that this speculation on the Trinity has not one iota in common with the biblical and historic Christian concept of the Trinity. A whole new meaning is poured into the old terms, and then the terms themselves are abolished entirely. If we are to know anything of the Trinity, we will do so only by humbly submitting ourselves to God's revelation of himself, which is to be found in the Bible, where men like Paul and John have indeed thought the matter fully through, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

EDWIN H. PALMER

SPECIALIZED TOPICS

The Study of the Parables, The Study of the Types, The Study of the Miracles, by Ada R. Habershon, Kregel Publications, 1957. *Types*, \$2.50, *Miracles and Parables*, \$3.95 each.

The book on Parables is strongly dispensational. Nevertheless the author concedes that parables can and do have historical, present and future truth, a principle by which she abides throughout. She is to be commended for this tolerant view, but the syncretism which is born from it seems to be exegetically impossible. This is especially true when the "future truth" is based upon dispensational presuppositions. Nevertheless the volume is rewarding and stimulating in many places.

The work on Types will reveal many things in the Old Testament to be types which most students of the Word have overlooked as being such. Certainly there are a few things which have been stretched to the point of being fanciful, but this does not minimize the positive contribution of this work. If carefully studied, it will open up much of the Old Testament to the average preacher and will cause him to ground his sermon material in biblical illustration.

The volume on Miracles is unusual and different from other works on this subject. It presents God's omnipotence in all his acts, and thus expects and understands and proves the miraculous. However, a great many of these acts of God, while exhibiting his power, cannot rightly fall under the category of miracle unless one considers everything to be miraculous.

The reviewer feels that of the three, the volume on Types is the most rewarding and has value for the minister.

KENNETH McCOWAN

THE TRUE STORY of THREE KOREAN WAIFS



Their father was employed as a laborer carrying coal to the piers in Pusan. It was difficult to support his wife and four children, so his wife helped as a peddler. They lived in a wretched hut, but ate fairly regularly. Then tuberculosis struck the father and he was confined to his bed. The money the mother made went for medicine. There was little left for food. Sang Dol, the oldest boy, with his little sister, carrying a sack, picked up pieces of coal dropped around the railroad. This they sold to buy a few vegetables, the cheapest food available. They did their best but could not save their father who died on November 20, 1957. They lost even their humble hut and had no place to live. The mother, with her youngest child on her back, left one morning seeking work. She and the baby have never been heard from since. Now Sang Dol, accompanied by the two younger children, continues the work of picking up pieces of coal. They are homeless, schoolless and always hungry.

The story of these three waifs can be repeated hundreds of times in South Korea today. Such children can be "adopted" and given food, shelter, education and—love. The cost to the contributor is the same in all of the countries listed below—\$10.00 a month. The child's name, address, picture and story is furnished the donor. The donor also can correspond with the "adopted" child.

For Information Write:
Dr. J. Calvitt Clarke
CHRISTIAN
CHILDREN'S FUND, INC.
Richmond 4, Virginia

I wish to "adopt" a boy.....girl.....
for one year in.....
(Name Country)

I will pay \$10 a month (\$120 a year).
Enclosed is payment for the full year
.....first month..... Please
send me the child's name, story, address and picture. I understand that
I can correspond with the child. Also,
that there is no obligation to continue
the adoption.

I cannot "adopt" a child but want
to help by giving \$.....
Please send me further information.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....Zone.....

State.....

Gifts of any amount are welcome.
Gifts are deductible from income tax.

Christian Children's Fund, incorporated in 1938 with its 264 affiliated orphanage-schools in 34 countries, is the largest Protestant orphanage organization in the world. It serves 25,000,000 meals a year. It is registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the International Cooperation Administration of the U. S. Government. It is experienced, economical and conscientious.

COUNTRIES:

Austria, Belgium, Borneo, Brazil, Burma, Finland, France, Free China, Greece, Hong Kong, India, Indochina, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Korea, Lapland, Lebanon, Macao, Malaya, Mexico, Okinawa, Pakistan, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Syria, United States, West Germany, American Indians or the greatest need.

FREE SOCIETY

(Cont'd from p. 34) Last word in the debate fell to Theodore Powell of the Connecticut Department of Education, who spoke to the conscience of Protestant and Catholic alike:

"If Protestant dominance grows, what will the Protestants do to the Catholics? . . . They will use the force of law and other means of social organization to promote Protestantism, to give advantage to Protestants and to impose disadvantages on Catholics; they will attempt to make the public schools Protestant schools. They will seek laws to make Catholics adhere to Protestant views on gambling and alcohol, while objecting to Catholic insistence on maintaining laws against birth control. They will frown on and will not encourage . . . the growth of Catholic schools.

"These are not things that *might* happen. They are happening right now . . .

"Protestants have not welcomed with much enthusiasm, Father Bosler, your Legion of Decency. But I suggest that you ask them to join Catholics in a Legion of Political Decency. A Legion to guard against improper—that is, political—means of proselytizing by religious bodies . . .

"A League that would insist that the religious mission is advanced most speedily, not by coercion of law, but by reasonable persuasion and spiritual appeal.

"A League that would insist that there are areas where the Church alone exercised authority and the State could neither forbid nor permit—in fact, areas where the State was not competent to act.

"Ask your Protestant brethren, Father Bosler, to agree that the command to go and teach all nations was given to the Apostles and not to Caesar's legionnaires.

"In short, I urge you to seek general recognition that the Church (of any faith) is working against itself when it permits legal or quasi-legal agencies to take over part of the Church's responsibilities . . .

"With such recognition, with such agreement, we could then place our faith in the free response of men's hearts to the divine message."

Dismissing the conference, President George N. Shuster of Hunter College acknowledged that the Fund for the Republic had sponsored the seminar "with great trepidation" lest it lead to "meaningless assent," but the discussion of "religion in a free society" had proved "the most distinguished undertaking yet," lifting its participants to "the verge of a new era of inter-group discussion." C. F. H.H.



Summer-time means vacations . . . conventions . . . camps . . . assemblies . . . and home. Wherever you are, be sure you have your Bible with you. Also have your copy of *The Upper Room* to use in your daily devotions.

The governor of one of the states started a trip, realized he had left his copy of *The Upper Room* at home, and drove back nearly twenty miles to get it. Don't forget yours!

Orders now being taken for the July-August issue. 7 cents each in lots of 10 or more to one address. Yearly subscriptions, \$1; three years, \$2. Air Mail Edition for young people and service men, same price. Order from

The Upper Room

The world's most widely used devotional guide

36 Editions — 29 Languages

1908 GRAND AVENUE

NASHVILLE 5, TENNESSEE

On the Ocean, near Downtown

DAYTONA

BEACH

FLORIDA

(A1A) SOUTH ATLANTIC AVE.

HALIFAX RIVER

(U. S. 1) ORANGE AVE.

- Luxurious apartments, efficiencies, and motel rooms.
- NEW SWIMMING POOL—HEATED.
- Air-Conditioned (Individually controlled) Central Heating.
- Free Parking Area.
- Near all attractions.

REASONABLE RATES

Free Bridge to Copacabana . . . Turn East at Orange Ave. from U. S. No. 1 over South Bridge to Southeast Corner A1A.



Copacabana

MOTEL

1201 S. ATLANTIC AVE.
(HIGHWAY A1A)

DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA

Phone:
Clinton 2-1452
or Write for
Reservations
NOW!

